

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



600099990%



NO UNION WITH ROME:

AN ANTI-EIRENICON.

BEING AN ANSWER TO THE

REUNION SCHEME OF DR. PUSEY.

BY

ALESSANDRO GAVAZZI,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL IN THE ITALIAN CHURCH.

"Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division."—LUKE xii. 51.

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."—MATT. x. 34.

"No peace with Rome."—BISHOP HALL.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

88, NEWMAN STREET, OXFORD STREET;

AND AT

WESTERTON'S, 20, ST. GEORGE'S PLACE, HYDE PARK CORNER.

1866.



130 f. 40.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE	PAGE 5
--------------------------	-------------------

CHAPTER I.

THE HALLUCINATION.

WHO?	14
WHAT?	25
WHERE?	33
WITH?	42
WHY?	48
HOW?	57
WHEN?	66
SUMMARY	73

CHAPTER II.

THE FALLACY.

THE IMPOSSIBLE—EXAMINATION OF COUNCILS	79
THE INCOMPATIBLE—EXAMINATION OF DOCTRINES . .	88
THE INADMISSIBLE—EXAMINATION OF ARTICLES AND DE- CREES	94
(a) RULE OF FAITH	97
(b) ATONEMENT	128
(c) SACRAMENTALISM	138
BAPTISM	148
LORD'S SUPPER	165

	PAGE
A. TRANSUBSTANTIATION	166
B. PRESENCE	175
C. SACRIFICE	186
D. COMMUNION	204
E. ADORATION	206
(<i>d</i>) DOCTRINE	225
1. PURGATORY	226
2. INDULGENCES	231
3. SAINTOLATRY	235
CELIBACY	246
SUMMARY	253

CHAPTER III.

THE SNARE.

THE CHURCH	257
THE COUNCILS	271
THE CREEDS	275
THE PRACTICAL SYSTEM	281
(<i>a</i>) WORSHIP	281
(<i>b</i>) DOCTRINE	285
(<i>c</i>) MARIOLATRY	290
SUMMARY	296

CHAPTER IV.

THE INJUSTICE.

COROLLARY	306
---------------------	-----

P R E F A C E.

IT has always been my custom and my good fortune to take to heart the noble disputes of the places in which I have resided, as though they were my own, or those of my own country. I speak, of course, of disputes relating to my religious profession. With regard to others, I should feel it was intrusive, on my part, to interfere, holding, as I do, that every community has a right to attend to its own local interests without the help of foreign counsel, especially if unsolicited, or if suggested by ignorance and impertinence.

But, with regard to religion, in Christian countries, all who love Christ in sincerity are under obligation to contribute with their

whole strength to preserve inviolate the purity of Christianity, and restore it when perverted by time and human agency. It is, therefore, the duty of every one to expose and combat error when he discovers it, with whomsoever it may originate. On this account, I have never ceased, during my lengthened residence in England, to war against the Papal system, miscalled Church. Knowing it thoroughly as I do, I have always felt it obligatory upon my conscience to denounce it as antagonistic to Evangelical Christianity, and inimical to civil and religious liberty. I have gone farther than this. I speedily discovered that Rome had a wily and daring ally in Oxford, and fully convinced myself that the leaders of the Tractarian party were only disguised Jesuits, whose object was gradually to pervert the English Church, by stupifying it with homœopathic doses of their asceticism, that it might eventually wake up to find itself in the arms of its mother, the Mother of Harlots. From the moment that I began to address the English public I have torn the mask from the faces of the traitors, and exhibited them in their true colours, that no sin-

cere Churchman, deceived by their sanctimonious appearance, should fall into their net, which is, in truth, Satan's net.

To say that my Christian chivalry has procured me a number of enemies, even greater than I could have desired, is to repeat what is known to everybody. I am only desirous that it should be equally well known that I rejoice and exult in their enmity, and thank God for it, inasmuch as it proves that I am not of their kith and kin. Still, from love of justice, I must assert that the Roman Catholics do not take the precedence in this respect. The most insolent, the most venomous, the most rabid, even to the vileness of calumny, are the Tractarians, and especially those of the azure collar.*

Under these circumstances, was it possible that I could pass over the EIRENICON of Dr. Pusey, the most audacious attempt upon the

* One of their latest pearls of this nature I have fished up from the Acherontian waters of the *Union Review*, No. XIX., p. 122, where I read with pleasure the following compliment:—"The Gavazzis, De Sanctis, and other Italian renegades." This I should call a compliment, even though cast in my face by that sacred impersonation of the *Cholera Morbus*. I call it a compliment when compared with the dirty insinuation of a certain Reverend W. R. Steward, D.D., of Leghorn, who assures his fanatics that I am still a Roman Catholic. And that man passes for one of my friends! *Cave me, Domine, ab amicis*: a thousand times better the cholera morbus.

Christianity of England which ever emerged from the arsenal of Tractarianism? Certainly not; and no sooner did it appear than I determined to confute it; though the execution of my design has been delayed in consequence of engagements previously contracted to deliver sermons and lectures in the provinces. But it is never too late to counsel means of safety.

That this EIRENICON is the most audacious attack of Tractarianism, is proved by the fact itself. While it issued nothing but Tracts, the question was confined to simpletons, since hearts which have no other guide in religion than the Bible, were not likely to be entangled in such webs fit only to attract the ignorant, and therefore merely partial. Moreover, so long as it was only a question of masquerade, as carried out in Margaret-street and Eldad churches, it affected none but crackbrains and fanatics, since souls used to worship God in spirit and in truth, as due to Him, were not inclined to run after harlequin vestments and adornments, the appreciation of such things being confined to fools, precisely like certain English, who take part once in their lives in the bacchanalia of the Roman Carnival, of

which these Tractarian harlequinades are a sacred imitation.

But the EIRENICON is something much worse. It proposes a reunion with Rome, which, of necessity, involves the national calamity of England. Reunion could be effected only at the cost of the prosperity and liberty of the English people, with no compensation but that of paying court to Rome and gratifying the sect of the Iscariots.* Hence the eulogiums so lavishly bestowed upon the EIRENICON by all the ultramontane organs of Tractarianism; one going so far as to declare, and with reason, that "such a step towards unity as Dr. Pusey's present work, has never been taken since the Reformation."†

I shall, therefore, combat this attempt at reunion with all my soul and all my might, as dangerous in the highest degree to England; and it will be a combat to the utmost.

My plan of refutation will be simple, though

* With my antagonist I shall seek to use language in conformity with his age and reputation, though I do not promise to stereotype myself in a perfectly English mould. With regard to his partisans, however, especially leaders and writers, whose insolence towards us is so audacious, I shall prove that an Italian can, when occasion requires it, give as good as he receives.

† *Union Review*, No. XIX., p. 3.

I shall take care to make it complete. I shall first show the hallucination in the nature and the object of the Puseyite scheme; after which, I shall prove that the writer's scheme of reunion is a mere fallacy on his part, a snare for the simple and credulous, an injustice to domestic Christianity.

When the subject permits of it, I shall seek to avoid dryness and heaviness. In any case, I shall steer clear of enigmas and the *abracadabra* of the theologian, who envelopes himself in the abstruse on purpose that he may be unintelligible.

In this manner shall I do my best, in my humble way, to aid in combating error and its champions, that England may maintain inviolate the precious legacy of her glorious Reformation, which is derided and condemned by implication in the work of Dr. Pusey, and pitilessly repudiated by those of his sect. Against the common enemy the defence must be common. I cannot consider myself a stranger among Christians, and my practical acquaintance with Romanism gives me a right to consider myself qualified for this sort of combat.

May God temper the courage and bless the efforts of him who fights for the cause of eternal truth !

ALESSANDRO GAVAZZI.

88, Newman-street, London,
March, 1866.

ANTI-EIRENICON.

CHAPTER I.

THE HALLUCINATION.

A MAN like Dr. Pusey, who writes controversy for the last time in his life (p. 4), ought to have a well-determined object in view. Nor does this appear to be doubtful in his case; for, though his apparent object is to answer the malignant attacks of Dr. Manning—the wonderful and ascetic man who had found out the way to serve God and Mammon, Jerusalem and Babylon, at the same time (p. 5)—yet the true and ultimate object of the writer is to persuade England that the time has come for her Church to unite with that of Rome. Manning's letter, then, is only the pretext for writing, the immediate object being the reunion.

Nor does Dr. Pusey make any mystery of his intention. The title of his work explains its object—"The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church and a Means of Restoring

Visible Unity." Hence the necessity of anatomizing the object itself, in order to prove it a hallucination in its very nature.

But, although limited only to Pusey's object, the material of this chapter is so abundant and varied, that I have discovered no better method of giving it form, than to dispose of it according to the dictates of that nonsense line taught in schools for the enumeration of parts, or amplification, and which runs thus :

Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando ; and which I shall translate—*who, what, where, with, why, how, when*. By the development of this, the nature and tendency of this fallacious EIRENICON will be clearly revealed.

I.

WHO ?

Although, in the nature of things, an initiative is required for great undertakings, and hence arises, as a legitimate consequence, the necessity of an initiator, either individual or complex, still I cannot see how the initiative of reunion with the Churches of Rome and Greece should come from Dr. Pusey, and still less from his party. It is an axiom admitted by all, that strict impartiality is required on the part of a negotiator who treats the affairs of one party with another, and that if the negotiator has any special interest, inclining him to one side rather than the other, it is dangerous for those he represents ; and this is precisely the case with Dr. Pusey and his party.

He should be the last, situated as he is, to subscribe to the reunion, if he would not impress it with his own character, which is anything but favourable to the undertaking. Dr. Pusey cannot deny that the suspicion of being more Papist than Anglican rests upon him and his colleagues. He himself admits the suspicion, naturally enough induced in the minds of sincere Churchmen, by the apostasy of all his early companions in Tractarianism (p. 281). A man, then, who is suspected of inclining to Papacy, and who is, indeed, held to be nine-tenths of a Papist, cannot take upon himself to promote reunion with Rome without injury to the undertaking which he advocates. The result at which the English must naturally arrive must be in accordance with the ancient coinage—*Cicero pro domo sua*—in other words, that with his scheme of reunion Pusey favours his own cause instead of that of the English Church and nation.

Nor is this the worst. It is not alone suspicion that paints Pusey as nine-tenths a Papist, but logical deduction judges and proves him to be such. The large share which he took in the compilation of the Tracts whose final object was the re-Romanization of England, and whose immediate result has been the Romanization of their principal compilers (p. 282); his various works all redolent of Romanism, and the works of others edited and studiously chosen by him from the emasculate asceticism of Rome; his opinions upon claustral celibacy, and his caliphic doctrine with regard to the holy obedience which ought to be observed in his nunneries;* the apostolate so fatally

* Speech at the Oxford Congress, July, 1862.

exercised by him over the clerical Oxonian youth poisoned with theories of sacramentalism and ritualism; and, lastly, the plan which he confesses (p. 281) to have cherished, in common with the Tractarian chiefs, of apostatizing to Rome, but only in due time, gradually, and with proper caution—all this causes him not only to be suspected of being inclined to Rome, but justly condemns him as more than nine-tenths a Papist. Nor can the Doctor complain of this public opinion, since it is in perfect conformity with the rule of the divine Redeemer, that trees and men are to be judged by their fruit.*

One who has plunged head-foremost into the mire of Rome, and whose feet alone are visible, cannot reason with his feet to those who are watching the struggles of his legs; "let us unite together in the mire;" but should simply say, "follow me, and bemire yourself as I have done." Thus the initiative of reunion with Rome could not have found a worse author or accomplice than Pusey, for the reason that, in favouring the fusion of the two Churches, he is favouring his own cause instead of that of others.

The least that can be said against this scheme of reunion is that it expresses not the voice of the Church but simply the outcry of a sect.

It is all very well that Pusey cites in his own favour the authority of the famous ultramontanist De Maistre, with regard to the office of the English Church as a conciliating mediator between Rome and Christendom (p. 260); but before I can accept the prophetic augury of the legitimist Savoyard on this

* Matt. vii. 16.

point, I must see it presented in the terms of its author, and not in those of Dr. Pusey.

Now, in the days of De Maistre, by the Church of England was not understood Tractarianism and Puseyism, but mere Anglicanism. If, therefore, the Church of England is to be taken as a mediatizing Church, it is to be as it was then, De Maistre having spoken of it as such, and not as it has been made, at the present day, by the sectarianism of Oxford. It is quite true, that even sixty years ago the anti-Christian anomaly of High and Low Church existed in the Church of England; but, in spite of that, the Church was sufficiently amalgamated and compact to be considered by the Papist writer as the organ of reconciliation. Let no one be offended at my decided aversion for the anti-Christian distinction of High and Low Church. I think I have read the Bible sufficiently to assure myself that nothing of the kind is to be found in the New Testament. What can be more offensive to the humility and brotherhood inculcated by Christ than the appellation of High Church? Is not the appellation itself in formal antagonism to all the doctrines of the Gospel? My hatred against the haughty appellation is increased by my conviction that the Church owes it to the too notorious Archbishop Laud, than whom, according to my belief, Lucifer never had a more faithful imitator. Suffice it here to conclude that Christ never instituted a High and a Low Church. He instituted his own one Church, to which its members belong, not by aristocracy of birth and money, not by pride of titles and patronage, not by might of human wisdom, but by sincerity of

faith and holiness of conduct. But, at the present time, the English Church, recommended as a conciliating medium, is altogether different from when it was pointed to as such by De Maistre. It is not even the High Church, but only the exclusivist Tractarianism of Dr. Pusey. All the rest of Protestantism—I speak unofficially—represented in England and its dependencies by the Establishment, by the Evangelicals, and by all Nonconformists or Dissepters, and in foreign countries by Lutheranism and Calvinism, are not only not asked to subscribe to the scheme of reunion, but, in various parts of the *EIRENICON*, are excluded from it as not forming a Church of any sort. So that even admitting the De Mestrian oracle, the English Church of Pusey, reduced by him to Tom Thumb proportions, could no longer be the means of reconciliation of the whole of Protestantism with Rome, but would only effect its own partial reunion, which is a thing so insignificant, that it is not worth the trouble of printing a book of 400 pages to effect it, and it was the less worth the trouble, since the Ultramontane Church of Oxford, both from its own inclination and the laws of gravitation, must and will sink finally into the Roman abyss.

This is the proper place to examine into the nature and pretensions of the Puseyitic Ultramontane Church, which assumes to itself the monopoly and benefits of the reunion. Good and sincere Churchmen will be no little astonished to find themselves excluded from the Church to which they have always believed themselves to belong. If they are not Ultramontanists with Pusey, they are not Churchmen at all. I read

with much satisfaction the proof of this assertion in the *Union Review*, where the panegyrist of the EIRENICON thus reproaches Manning: "Dr. Manning has confused the English people with the English Church (as he also confuses the English Church with the English Establishment), in trying to apply his principles to Anglicanism."* Anglicanism, then, is not in the people, but in the English Church, and the English Church is not in the Establishment, but simply in the Catholicism of Oxford.

This is what the Puseyite party intend solely by English Church. Then, even High Churchmen who do not incline to Puseyism, and who consider themselves as orthodox adherents of the Established Church, are not among the elect, and do not belong to the English Church, from which all Evangelical Churchmen are doubly excluded, because they dare to call themselves Protestants, and form a Protestant alliance.

Nothing can be more horrible than that, according to the neo-Catholics of Ultramontaniam. The true English Church is not Protestant. Not only do I remember to have seen this asserted by Brother Ignatius, the kisser of the Pope's slipper, in his apology for monkery, but I meet with it in every page of this ultramontane party. The chronicler in the *Union Review*, speaking of a book of Father Melia, the Jesuit, thus expresses himself: "Being a foreigner, he is no doubt unaware that the Church of England nowhere officially uses the title 'Protestant.'" In his second edition, this *erratum* must be corrected.† Officially, it may not use it, since it did not protest at

* *Union Review*, p. 18.

† *Ibid.*, p. 112.

Spire with the German Reformers; but as the title Protestant implies, at the present day, according to general estimation, any reformed Church, the Church of England need feel it no dishonour to be called a Protestant Church. The Church, then, which is to be the medium of union is neither the Protestant nor the Established Church, but merely the Catholic Church of Dr. Pusey and his followers.

This, then, and this alone, is the English Church which is to be the promoter of the reunion. This pretension may well be accorded, since it involves the reward, deserved by such impertinent vanity as I shall substantially prove.

As every one may see, the terms of the proposition are completely changed. The assertion of De Maistre was, that the English Church, as it existed in his time, was to be the organ of reconciliation of the whole of Protestantism with the Church of Rome. The EIRENICON and its partisans, on the other hand, speak of an English Church *sui generis*, an Oxonian or Ultramontane Church, which seeks only its own exclusive reunion with Rome. I know not how this change of terms, this sectarian substitution, would be accepted at the present day by Bossuet, by Du Pin, or even by Gladstone, who considers the compliment of De Maistre so flattering with regard to the old Anglican Church.

Their judgment has, however, no weight whatever in the solution of the grave problem. It is Rome alone who must solve it. With regard to reunion, it is for Rome to decide whether it can be accepted, and whether the Church which seeks it is worthy of it.

Nor could Rome be more explicit upon the point than in the letter which Cardinal Patrizi, as prefect of a congregation, addressed, in the name of the Pope, to a hundred and twenty-nine clergymen of the so-called English Church, who had expressed their desire for the reunion.* Listen to the oracle, and you will have proof of the hallucination of these reverend utopians. They boast of being priests and Catholics, which the Cardinal sharply denies in these terms: "That such should be your fate (to have wandered from the right way), grieves this sacred congregation, seeing that you look upon yourselves as belonging to the true Church of Jesus Christ, as part and parcel of that Christian order which boasts of having the succession of the priesthood and of the name of Catholic, although separated and divided from the apostolic chair of Peter. Than this opinion nothing can be more alien (*abhorrent*) to the genuine notion of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is the Church which, founded upon the one Peter, possesses the unity of faith and love in one single body joined together and compact." And after having refuted the claims of the Oxfordites to the priesthood, and to the name of Catholic, the terrible Cardinal proceeds a step farther, and denies that they belong to the Church of Christ at all. "No sect whatever, separated from external and visible communion with and obedience to the Roman Pontiff, can be a Church of Christ, nor belong in any manner to the Church of Christ."† In order to make it clear that his words were addressed not only to the me-

* Rome, November 8, 1865.

† Ibid.

morialists, but to the whole of the mysterious family of the A. P. U. C., the inexorable Cardinal thus stigmatizes it: "Hence it may be known why this sacred congregation has manifested so much solicitude lest the faithful in Christ (Roman Catholics, of course) should be induced to co-operate or in any way favour the society recently formed by you with the object of promoting, as you say, the unity of Christ."*

Now let us argue upon these infallible premisses. There is at Rome, in the Church of *San Pietro in vinculis*, a spurious chain, professedly resulting from the union of the two chains with which Saint Peter was bound at Jerusalem and at Rome. This miracle was effected only to prove the identity of the two chains. The one sent to Rome by the Empress Eudocia, could never have joined itself to that which the Roman bishop had in his possession, had it not truly been the chain of Jerusalem. This is how miracles are fabricated at Rome; but by Roman Catholics, among whom the manufacture is traditionally legitimate, every article which issues from it is considered and transmitted as genuine, although originally and substantially an imposture. The same may be said of its pretension to exclusive right to the Catholic name and priesthood. So long, however, as Rome persists in this sacrilegious opinion, it has a right to reject as Catholics separatists from the apostolic chair, and hence it has the right to refuse their claims to reunion. The two Churches are heterogeneous, and therefore cannot unite. It is absolutely useless for the fanatics of the union to protest, on

* Car. Patrizi.—Ibid.

the contrary, that they are as much Catholics as the Papists. So long as Rome denies it, all argument is vain. Now Rome has spoken and declared you to be no Catholics, consequently, *volentes nolentes*, you are wanting in the characteristics of Catholicism necessary for union with Rome. *Roma locuta est, causa finita est.*

So long as you remain in the true English Church, founded upon the rock Christ, you will be in Christ's sight not only Catholics, but Christians. By departing from it to unite with Rome, you would lose in the way your characteristics of English Catholics which form a passport of no account at the Flaminian Gate, within which you would be admitted only as penitent and repenting heretics. The Church which, with impious blasphemy, is founded upon Peter alone, can accept no compromise; to recognise your catholicity in Christ, would be to lose its own, which is founded upon Satan.*

Hence we are led to conclude that the reunion with Rome, proposed by Dr. Pusey and his party, is no other than an hallucination. I must confess I should like to know in what spirit the fanatics of the union received the letter of the Cardinal Vicar of the Pope. What can be said of it by Pusey, who was so smitten by the prophecy of De Maistre? Is not Patrizi greater than De Maistre? You who set yourself so actively to work, encouraged by the augury of the Papistic layman, must now desist, since the Cardinal, employed by the Pope, has infallibly declared that you cannot propose the union, nor

* Matt. xvi. 28.

can Rome consent to it. This will be a splendid opportunity for Dr. Pusey to exercise heroically the virtue of holy obedience, so much recommended by him to his nuns.

To you then, Dr. Pusey and your party, I throw the gauntlet, and defy you to prove that you can unite with Rome. My defiance is founded upon the *authoritative* letter of Cardinal Patrizi. Reverend gentlemen! be more honest to your Church, whose bread you eat, and whose honours you usurp, and then you will see that an unfathomable abyss lies between the true English Church and that of Rome. All your Oxford Tracts are insufficient to bridge over the chasm. The bridge formed by them is not wider than a razor's blade, and is less practicable even than that of the Koran. To fill up the abyss, nothing less will be required than to cast into it all the abuses, errors, and abominations of the Church of Rome, which you have so largely imitated, and even they would be insufficient. Find, then, another Quintus Curtius, seated upon the chair of Saint Peter, to throw himself, with his fictitious apostolic chair, and the whole paraphernalia of his usurped supremacy, into the gulf. When it is thus filled in, then you may pass over to the other side, and finding mere Christianity, and not mere Catholicism, the Gospel and not the Tridentine, then may you offer the hand of concord and be reunited in fact. When this event takes place the ultramontaniam of Rome will have happily disappeared with the Iscariotism of Oxford, and there will no longer be any hallucination.

II.

WHAT?

Let us first define and then discuss the object. In the EIRENICON, the sole and immediate object is the union of the three Churches—Roman, Greek, and English, the three Catholic Churches of Christianity. According to a Catechism endorsed by a certain Mr. Carter, “the object is the incorporate reunion of the three great bodies of divided Christendom.”* In the Papistic panegyric of De Lisle upon Pusey’s scheme, the object is “to return to a corporate union with the great mother Church, from which, in an evil hour, they (the English) had been ruthlessly torn.”† In the course of this book I shall discuss the insolent charlatanism of limiting all Christianity to three Churches. Here I wish especially to discuss the union with Rome, which is the most sought after by the Puseyites, as proved by their writings and their proceedings.

Now, if we could for a moment, by way of hypothesis, entertain the hope that the Roman Church would give up its ultramontanism and occupy itself with the reform of all its abuses, so as to return to what it was at the time of the glorious Apostle Paul, then the talk about reunion with it would be the best proof of living in the spirit of Christianity and of desire for its triumph. But if all the efforts of men of sincerity—if all the fears occasioned by the Reformation of Luther, were insufficient to induce Rome

* *Union Review*, No. XIX., p. 84.

† *Ibid.*, p. 83.

to reform its abuses—if the last œcumenical councils of Basle, Constance, and even Trent, failed in their object of reforming the Church, the Curia, and the Court of Rome of their abuses—if all the most zealous reformers, from Arnold of Brescia down to Ugo Bassi, have suffered shipwreck on the rock of Papal abuse, and paid with their lives the price of their zeal, what distant shadow of repentance can encourage Pusey to write of reunion with such a Church?

In the school of sentimentalism, to proclaim oneself the author and mediator of peace sounds well, and gains much sympathy and many fanatic admirers for the pacificator (*Eirenicos*). But sentiment does not always reason, and too often deceives, to be chosen as arbitrator and guide in religious disputes. The truth, and the truth alone, should arbitrate in such cases. Hence the union with Rome is to be desired and promoted only when it can be proved to be a union of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. To cry “peace” is a beautiful prerogative to attract the crowd of drunkards to the cup of Oxford asceticism; but there can be no peace, and there ought to be no union, while one of the contracting parties is living in error. In such case, peace would be crime and reunion abomination in the sight of God. Can there be agreement between God and Belial?

From this it follows that it is the duty of Pusey, in proposing reunion with Rome, first to prove that there is no error in the Roman Church. I remark here, by the way, that Rome itself, though solicited by the Puseyitical party, would accept the reunion only on condition of finding the Church of England

without error, or, as the Church of Rome expresses it, free from heresy; and just because Rome finds heresy in the English Church does she definitively reject the union in the letter of Cardinal Patrizi. I have, then, to thank Dr. Pusey for furnishing me with the best argument against his scheme of reunion.

Not only has Pusey not proved that the Church of Rome is without error, but, with much study and varied erudition, has he fully demonstrated, in his *ETRENNICON*, that the Roman Church is in a great measure in error, and lives solely by error. And this not alone with regard to infallibility, to appeals, to the principedom of the Popes, but in the entire practical system or *quasi de fide*, as well as in certain points *de fide*—as, for example, that of the immaculate conception of Mary.

Error does, then, actually exist in the Church of Rome. Therefore, unless the Church of Rome puts away its errors, union with it is impossible in a Gospel sense, and is undesirable even in a Puseyitic sense, which would doubtless not wish to accept its ultramontaniam. To propose union with error is to commit suicide. But error exists in the Church of Rome, ergo no truly Christian heart can desire to unite with it—under such circumstances, to perish with it. Let it reform itself first, and then talk of reunion. When that time comes, I shall not be the last to advocate it.

To unite with Rome as it is at the present day would be to renew the torture of Massentius, who caused living Christians to be bound mouth to mouth with Pagan corpses, that with the decay of the latter

the former might perish by the most horrible of martyrdom. Since Pusey has proved to his own heart's entire satisfaction (pp. 278-281) that the English Church of the present day possesses such a spirit as it never did before, that in it now more than ever all is orthodoxy, piety, zeal, and charity, and since, on the other hand, the Doctor admits that there is in the Church of Rome putridity of doctrine and practice, what advantage could be derived from their union, or what effect, save the destruction of the present vitality of the English Church? Dr. Pusey should not forget that he has combated the error of the "developments," and that these are now more prominent than ever in the Roman Church, as proved by its last definitions, the encyclical and the syllabus; therefore to unite with it in the development of such pestiferous miasma would be to incur destruction by its poison.

The sublime command of Paul, to maintain "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace,"* implies, first of all, the presence of the Spirit. Where this is wanting—and it is altogether wanting where human dogmas are added to the divine doctrines of the Gospel, as is the case with Rome—there can be no unity, and the bond of peace, where the unity of the Spirit is wanting, resembles the union of gunpowder and fire, calculated only to blow the stupid Church which could patronise such a union into the air.

If Rome is in error in many respects, which Dr. Pusey cannot deny, to promote union with it is contrary to the command of Christ, who warns us to depart from it.† In this case, it is the Author of peace

* Eph. iv. 3.

† Rev. xviii. 4.

himself, the divine Jesus, who gives us to understand that he did not come to bring such peace, nor did he send such peace to his own people, but rather division and sword;* the sword of the Word, which, with a single blow, should destroy every bond between error and truth.

How could Dr. Pusey, with his principles, arrive at a different conclusion from mine? One of two things: either Rome is in error, or she is not. If not in error, why does Dr. Pusey accuse her of error? If in error, then why does Dr. Pusey recommend union with her? Does the leader of Oxford see a family likeness in the Roman Church because it is itself Catholic? But can a Church be catholic or orthodox which favours and accepts error?

I will not here dwell long upon the infatuation of those who can find nothing good in a Church which has not the appellation of Catholic. I call it infatuation with reason. The human ever seeks to take the place of the divine. Catholic is, in fact, nothing but an accidental and scholastic name; traditional if you will, but by no means biblical. The first and true fathers in Jesus Christ were not Catholics, but Christians; and Augustine the Great well observed with regard to this subject, that as we are Christians from Christ, so Peter is such from the rock, and not *vice versâ*. Thus it was that the first followers of the Nazarene were originally called Christians and not Catholics in Antioch.† For me, then, but small importance attaches to the appellation of *Catholic Church*, the designation of *Christian Church*

* Matt. x. 34.

† Acts xi. 26.

appearing to me quite sufficient; and I adhere the rather to this biblical expression in that the EIRENICON itself has proved to me that a Church may be Catholic, as the Roman calls itself, and be full of errors which, being in themselves the negation of evangelical Christianity, exclude the said Church from Christianity in the strict signification of the term. This has ever been my view since I have learned to know Christ. According to this view, Christianity of necessity implies Catholicism, but Catholicism does not always imply Christianity. Men of a sect always prefer their scholastic utopianisms to the wide and generous views of the Bible. On this account, Dr. Pusey glories in the confession of a Catholic Church; and why? Because he finds the expression in a creed, afterwards repeated and, indeed, enlarged in other creeds. Thus a creed (which is nothing else than a human formula) is substituted for the word of God, which gives to the true Church of Christ another appellation, the proper one, and the only one orthodox, which by its very nature rejects the smallest trace of error. This, then, is the infatuation.

Perhaps Dr. Pusey, with his learning, can give an aspect of reasonableness and wisdom to this infatuation. I think not, and shall prove it from his own arguments. "The chaos into which some minds were thrown suspecting Catholic truth, because their guides had become Roman, not English, Catholics . . . has, indeed, checked but not hindered the work of God among us" (p. 281). Let the reader observe that our Doctor makes a grave distinction between

Roman Catholic and English Catholic. Therefore, though both are Catholics in name, there is such a difference of blood, face, and form, that they are not to be recognised as of the same family. Were they one and the same, sincere Protestants would have no reason to suspect Catholic truth—read Christian truth, for the truth is a substance, and not an accident—because their guides, even though they passed from the national Church over to Rome, would not change families nor betray their own brethren.

If the distinction between Roman and English Catholics logically exists, it exists only in consequence of substantial differences of doctrine and practice; and if such differences exist, not only is it an hallucination to desire to promote the union before such differences have been settled and removed, but it is treachery against the cause of truth and brethren who are thus sacrificed to the mania of a supposed Catholic Church.

But let us pursue our argument, and seek to establish the real aim of Dr. Pusey in proposing the union, and that by means of his own words:—"It seemed, indeed, before these secessions that, with the continuance of God's gracious operations, nothing but time was needed to catholicize England" (p. 281). Now, what does "to catholicize England" mean? If the English are English Catholics, which Pusey not only admits but defends, they have no need to be catholicized. If the English Church never was so catholic as now (p. 282), it has no need to be catholicized. If the English Church is officially the Church of the nation, and the nation through it is

already Catholic, and in a superlative degree of catholicity, then the English nation has no need to be catholicized. I propose a dilemma, and then arrive at my conclusion. England either is or is not Catholic. If it is not Catholic, it cannot ask to unite itself with Catholic Rome; and all that Pusey has written about its Catholicism is only a libel, or at least ironical. If, on the other hand, England is Catholic, I do not see the need of catholicizing it.

What do these words signify, then? In other parts of his work Dr. Pusey laments the secession of Newman to Rome as occurring too soon, and thus disconcerting the plans of those who wished to take the same course, but at their own ease (p. 282). I may be permitted to conclude from these Puseyitic premisses, that by the specious pretext of catholicizing England, nothing is intended but its re-Romanization. Had the first secessionists deferred their apostasy a little longer, they, who had already laboured most abundantly, might have been the immediate instruments of re-Romanizing their Church. But they have had multiplied successors. "The trumpet had sounded, steady, clear, certain, and a very great army had gathered at the call. . . . The leaven which was hidden in the meal has worked secretly, and has now more centres, from which it is everywhere working" (pp. 282, 283). Puseyism is, then, working everywhere to re-Romanize England. That the chief of the sect, in his *EIRENICON*, eulogises this traitorous work, and applies to it the sacrilegious expression, "the work of God," proves beyond all doubt that the direct, though concealed, object of his

book and of his party is no other than the re-Romanization of England. Is this honest? is it prudent? is it Christian? Far from it; and on this account I have designated it as the traitors' work. If it is an insult to restrict Christendom to the three Churches—Roman, Greek, and English; if even by their corporate reunion the result would be only partial and sectarian, and not the universal union of the Christian family; if by the English Church nothing is meant but the portion limited to Puseyism, and which is called Catholic only in jest, or by mistake; if all its adherents' views and labours tend to nothing but the re-Romanization of the English nation—then the most charitable corollary at which I can arrive is, that the object proposed by the EIRENICON is a superlative hallucination.

III.

WHERE?

Here the question naturally arises of the place in which the dispute is to be decided, and where the combatants are to meet. These things are not done in the air. All the councils have had a locality in which they could come to an agreement. Now, as the movement for reunion originated in England, as all appearances show that Puseyism indulges the idea of being able to treat it upon English ground, why not Oxford? Indeed, why not Christ Church College, beneath the shadow of the tower and under the sonorous protection of Tom? The plausibility of ar-

gument is not wanting in support of this proposition. For if, according to De Maistre, the English Church is destined to be the medium of conciliation—I speak of the original proposition and not of the Puseyite abortion—it appears perfectly natural that the meeting should take place in its territory. Nor is the question unimportant, since the nature and the customs of the place in which the meeting occurs can but have a great effect and much influence over the decision of the council.

In this respect, the Unionist sect shows neither doubt nor division. In fact, the first attempt at union was made by it in London in the year 1865, with a view to see if it could effect a breach in the tetragon of the Greek Church. We have, then, a positive datum to serve as a rule in judging of other attempts which are to be made with a like object.

The first attempt was a complete failure, as it must inevitably be, since, with the question of place, many other questions are associated both as preliminaries and concomitants, want of agreement with regard to which must always cause such undertakings to prove abortive.

Imprimis, it should be laid down as a maxim, that the work of uniting hostile Churches will be badly performed by those who do not agree in their own. Was the Church of England fully and conscientiously represented at this gathering? Certainly not. A Berlin correspondent of the *Times* asserted that the meeting represented only the High Church, or rather only the ultramontanism of the High Church. The few exceptions who figured in it, mainly from exigen-

cies of position or superintendence, in no degree destroy my proposition that the English Church was not fully or conscientiously represented. Now, is it not perfectly absurd to see men zealous for union with the Greek Church carrying to the assembly the discord which actually reigns in their own Church as a pledge of permanent union between them for the future? Here I am anticipating a subject which I shall develop in the fourth chapter of this book, that the first duty of a Church is agreement between its members, and mutual concessions among the brethren, before it seeks for union and agreement with foreign and naturally hostile Churches. The result of this attempt could be no other than a failure, when the so-called representatives of the Greek Church were not legally authorized representatives but mere *dilettanti* of unity, who, in spite of their holy zeal and excellent intentions, having no authority of any kind, could neither propose nor accept officially any arrangement of the assembly. This is sufficient proof that, prior to assembling in council, the basis of discussion should be agreed upon, the subjects for discussion selected, the limits of the concessions to be asked and granted, on either side, defined; and that each party should select its representatives in its own way, and furnish them with the necessary powers. Thus only can they succeed in understanding each other, and coming to any positive agreement. From want of these preliminaries, the first attempt at union proved abortive, and its sole result, if it had any result at all, was to show that the two Churches never can unite.

The most absurd feature of the affair was that the

English unionists spoke of present intercommunion even before any agreement had been come to upon the principal question of unity. It is true that Dr. Pusey tries to prove (p. 59) that the suspension of intercommunion does not necessarily destroy unity, but his assumption cannot prove that where there is no unity there can be intercommunion. The questions which long divided the Churches of Asia Minor and Africa from Rome were not dogmatic questions, so that, notwithstanding the suspension of intercommunion, the unity of the Spirit was maintained between them, although without the bond of peace. But in the case of the London meeting, how could there be intercommunion with the Greek Church when the English Church so legitimately differs from it?

In fact, laying aside a hundred other points of divergence, what intercommunion can there be between two Churches, one of which believes blindly in transubstantiation—whatever be the name which it gives to the impious doctrine—and the other believes only in a spiritual sense in the reality of the body and blood of Christ? And with regard to the practical system of the two Churches, how can the Anglican, which professes to worship God in spirit and in truth, agree with the Greek, which has so much materiality and falsehood in its worship, that it is truly idolatry and abomination in the sight of God? Is not this worse than hallucination?

But even worse yet; for absurdity begets absurdity, as one abyss precedes a deeper. In this proposal of intercommunion Pusey and his party not only proved themselves imprudent, but inconsistent. The aversion

of Churchmen of this class towards everything savouring of dissent is notorious. It is a fact but too well known, that one of these ultramontanists of the High Church would consider himself profaned by entering a dissenting chapel, and would think it a sacrilege to partake in it of the Lord's Supper. And yet, though Dissenters protest against the Church of England in certain points, as a rule Churchmen and Dissenters agree in the essential doctrines of dogmas, and all equally take the Bible as their sole rule of faith. Substantially, then, the unity of the Spirit exists between Churchmen and Dissenters, though the bond of peace is wanting. Thus keeping to Pusey's own theory, although intercommunion does not exist between them, their unity is not destroyed. How is it, then, Puseyites, that you reject intercommunion with Dissenters, with whom you agree in doctrine, and propose it with the Greeks, from whom you are dogmatically at the antipodes ?

The place, then, selected by Puseyism for this meeting of hostile Churches is, in my opinion, of unfortunate augury and the worst possible choice. God will never bless the union with strangers while divisions exist among brethren ; nor can foreigners desire union with the English, so long as they are frightened by the unchristian spectacle of their domestic discords. What security, indeed, for lasting brotherhood does the Church of Pusey offer to that of Greece and Rome, when it is unable to maintain brotherly harmony with its own countrymen ?

It may be, however, that I am mistaken in my appreciation of the facts here stated, and that, after

all, neither Pusey nor his party are inconsistent when they refuse intercommunion with Dissenters and seek it with Greece and Rome. The Dissenters are essentially Protestant, and the High Church absolutely denies that it belongs to Protestantism; so that the logical result is that intercommunion cannot exist between them, and that which applies to Dissenters at home must be expected to apply equally to Dissenters abroad, with whom, according to Pusey's own words, his Church has nothing to do.

But the affair changes its aspect when the Greek or Roman Church is in question. They are both "Catholic Churches," and this qualification alone suffices, with the Anglican ultramontanists, to make them one with their Church, which is not Protestant, but, like them, "Catholic." These magic words, "Catholic Church," presuppose, at least by implication, that unity of doctrine exists between them, otherwise they could not be called Catholic. In fact, either there is error of dogma in one or other of these three Churches, and then they are Catholic only ironically speaking, or in jest; or else they are really Catholic or orthodox, and then there must be unity between them. It is true that, seeing Pusey has proved there are errors existing in the Roman and also in the Greek Church, the title of Catholic assumed by them is assumed under a false pretence, and is really a forgery; but with regard to two Churches calling themselves Catholic, we must not look so minutely into things. The title itself of Catholic is a good wide cloak, which can cover a sufficiently large number of errors.

That this is the real state of the case is proved by

the fact of the EIRENICON itself, which treats of union with these only, and it is also proved by the practice of the Anglican ultramontanists, especially when travelling upon the Continent, where they can indulge their desires for intercommunion with Rome undisturbed by criticism and without fear of reproof. That they do so, I have myself often been witness in various parts of the Continent, more particularly in Italy, to my intense disgust.

I choose from a thousand such facts one which occurred during Lent 1865, while I was preaching Christ and his Gospel at Siena. Two of these Puseyitical clergymen with their ladies entered the cathedral during the sermon, which I went to hear, in order to refute it, the preaching friar who delivered it being paid to abuse the Evangelicals. At the conclusion, the two reverend gentlemen, having to pass before the high altar, on which the sacrament was placed for public adoration, knelt before the host with every sign of reverence and faith, to my great annoyance, but with the visible approval of the Romanists present. They believed then that Jesus Christ in person was in that piece of paste, and, therefore, worshipped it, though this belief is in direct contradiction with the Twenty-eighth Article of their Church. Thus Puseyites unite with Rome in the worst of idolatry—the adoration of Christ in a piece of bread!

But I am not surprised at their adoration. The fact is stated in the history of Saint Anthony of Padua—which fact Father Newman pompously preached upon to his Oratorians—that a mule to which Anthony pre-

sented the consecrated wafer instantly knelt down and adored it, thus proving that it recognised the real corporeal presence of Christ in the cake, denied even in those times by so-called heretics.

If, therefore, a mule may have such a spiritual eye as to see, and such dogmatic faith as to adore, Christ in the host, who would refuse the two reverend Puseyites and their colleagues the valued prerogative, yea, rather the right, of imitating a mule in faith and adoration of the wafer? But though intercommunion with mules may please Puseyism, it is offensive to hearts regenerated to the Apostolic Christianity of the Gospel in Italy.

But the mischief wrought in my country by these Papists in Protestant masks is incalculable. The Italians believing them to be Protestants, and seeing them approve the most monstrous doctrines and practices of Rome, are induced to reject the benefits of the Reformation as nothing better than Popery, and thus fall into absolute atheism or remain in the Papacy, since those whom they believed to be opposed to it honour its doctrines and practices. Thus the example of these travelling Judases is fatal to the religious revival of the Peninsula.

And it would seem that this is the object that these ultramontane Anglicans have proposed to themselves in Italy, since by words, acts, and the press (with this diabolical intent, they keep a public journal in their pay at Florence), do they seek to persuade the Italians to remain Papists. The Papacy, say they, is the landmark of order and legitimacy, and the Papal Church the centre and the depository of the truth and of

the hierarchy. This is a mission altogether Satanic, for it is devoted to the Antichrist system, with the view of perpetuating it among Italians at the very moment when they are upon the point of abandoning it for the Gospel.

Let us now recapitulate all that belongs to the question of place. If England cannot be proposed, certainly Rome will not be proposed for the discussion of the union. In Rome, the deputies from the other Churches would find themselves in the very midst of the enemy's camp, exposed to seduction and to bribery with regard to the conditions of peace, so that they would be unable to exercise freely the powers conferred upon them as deputies, in which character they ought to be free from every suspicion of intrigue. Hence the necessity of determining, first of all, the place in which the discussion is to be held; a choice more difficult than may at first sight appear, as proved by the example of the last Council of Trent. The Emperor would not have it in a Papal city, and the Pope would not have it in an Imperial city, to avoid the consequences of the influence which every monarch exercises in his own country. After prolonged study and much divergence of opinion, Trent was finally chosen as a city, which to both parties seemed sufficiently neutral to be free from any preponderating influence. This proves that a slight wish for union may lurk in the brain of an individual so long as it is not likely to be realized. But if it is to be realized, it must pass from a faint wish to a concrete state of things; which can never be the case without well-concerted preliminaries, not the

least of which is the choice of the place in which the council for reunion shall be held.

IV.

WITH?

It will not appear strange, I hope, if I ask Dr. Pusey what arms and what auxiliaries he thinks of employing to effect a work so gigantic, and, at the same time, so difficult, and which has already been attempted in vain. We have seen (§ 1) that the initiative of the undertaking is altogether in the hands of the ultramontanism of the High Church. Let us here see more clearly who are to be elected, who excluded, in conducting this so loudly-vaunted reunion. A very equivocal, if not an absolutely suspicious expression, is made use of by the ultramontane Doctor, as to the possibility of "organic reunion of Christendom, and of the Protestant bodies too" (p. 259). This is indeed a new Oxford distinction between Christianity and Protestantism. Perhaps in the mind of the sagacious Doctor, Christianity is personified by the three Churches of Rome, Greece, and England, and Protestantism, by all the followers of the Reformation, whatever their denomination. As the phrase sounds, however, Protestantism is admitted to the benefits of the union only by mere accident, by the way and at second hand, as an act of condescension on the part of the three privileged Churches, which would permit it to follow their lead and unite with them. In fact, though Pusey sought the alliance

of the Evangelicals in combating the rationalism of the *Essays and Reviews* (p. 4), he does not care to solicit their co-operation for union with Rome. I say nothing about the Dissenters, whom he looks upon as mere fragments of faith, and who, according to him, are only the shadow of the Anglican Church, without which they would have no existence of any sort (p. 11). Thus he excludes every auxiliary which does not belong to his distilled Tractarianism; and thus does he also destroy the force of his favourite quotation from the pious Möhler, which our Doctor copies from Wiseman, one of his texts of reverend authority.

Now, Möhler does not address himself to the English Church exclusively in the hope of future connexion, but to all Protestants in general; so that if the English Church is not in the widest sense a Protestant Church, it is, *de facto*, excluded from the union. The following are the words of Möhler (p. 269): "Learn, then, Protestants, once for all, the greatness of the abuses with which you reproach us by the greatness of your own misdeeds. This is the ground upon which the two Churches will one day meet, and take each other by the hand. Urged by our common faults, we ought both to exclaim, 'We have all failed; the Church alone cannot fail: we have all sinned; the Church alone is pure from all stain.'"

I would here hint, in passing, how greatly both author and quoter err in supposing that the ground on which Churches are to meet and shake hands is that of abuses and errors. Can anything worse be conceived? If they meet on such ground—and at

present they do so meet—it can be only to reproach each other with their faults, or to perpetuate them. No, utopian reverends, *non talis auxiliis*. The only ground on which union can take place, and prove lasting, is that of truth; consequently, on that of the Bible alone. When you say that the Church alone cannot fail, you admit, of necessity, though perhaps unawares, the infallibility of the Bible. What is the Church which cannot fail? It is certainly not the Roman, since you yourself point to the greatness of its abuses in proof that it has failed; nor can it be the English, since it is included in the greatness of its derelictions (*égarements*) from truth. The Church, then, which cannot fail is the sole Church of Christ, and the Church of Christ is to be found only in the Bible. This is the ground, then, on which alone it is right and possible to give each other the hand; all other ground is questionable, if not positively dangerous.

However desirable it may be to arrive at union with the Greek and Roman Churches, as the initiative cannot come exclusively from Dr. Pusey and his party, so neither should the undertaking be conducted by them alone. Unless the whole of Protestantism unites on the one side, and Greece and Rome on the other, it will be but a half, one-sided, sectarian union.

When Pusey speaks of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches, perhaps he thinks he has exhausted the catalogue of the family of Christ. I can scarcely credit this, or else I should see a blasphemy the more and a brother the less at the banquet of

Christian concord. To confine the Church to three denominations is to repeat the proceeding of sending Christ from Caiphas to Pilate, and from Pilate to Herod, with the sole result of crucifying him ignominiously on Golgotha. Do not keep Christ all to yourselves; be generous enough to leave him the common and universal property of all Christians who in him, by him, and with him, form the true Church of the God-Redeemer.

What other credentials does Pusey ask before he admits to the privilege of co-operation with him in the undertaking of the reunion? Episcopacy? (p. 270.) In that case, he is too learned to be ignorant that there are many other Churches besides the Grecian, Roman, and Anglican which have episcopacy, even among those of the Reformation. Why, then, should not these aid in the undertaking? Why, moreover, exclude the Evangelicals, who obey the same episcopacy as himself—the episcopacy of the Church of England—which he proclaims to be legitimate and of apostolical succession? But is it then absolutely necessary to have this form in order to be a Church of Christ? If so, I would beg of Dr. Pusey to explain an enigma which I observe among his partisans, and for which I cannot account: I speak of the contempt which his ultramontane followers show for the episcopacy of the English Church—contempt which I mark at the present time wherever Puseyite clergymen minister to congregations obliged, *nolens volens*, to accept them. When entreated, counselled, and warned by their bishops to desist from their ritualistic aberrations, they pay as much heed as the moon to

the barking of a dog. And when the Episcopate *en masse*, in Convocation, in its answers, charges, and deliberations, resolve to make head against these pernicious innovations—this revival of mediæval Romanism—it is truly marvellous to note the amount of Satanic vituperation with which it is assailed in the pulpits, the writings, and journals of the infuriated horde of ultramontane Puseyites.* Do you call this

* I here give some specimens of their sacred rage:

"The Bishops alway do deprecate . . . or Bishops will never be slow to 'crown the edifice' when it stands towering to the skies, but they are rather apt to 'deprecate' the work while we are toiling and delving at the foundations."—*Church Times*, Feb. 17, 1866, p. 53.

"Thus go to show that while the shameless laxity of the Low Church clergy is beneficently winked at, not a few of our prelates will go out of their way and stretch their power to the utmost in order to crush a Catholic (i.e. *Puseyitic*) curate, or harass and thwart a Catholic (i.e. *Tractarian*) incumbent. To our readers and ourselves (*of course*) the conviction thus forced upon us is highly 'provocative'—just the sort of provocation, in fact, to goad one into adopting 'a tone of defiance.'"—*Ibid.*, p. 57.

"The Upper House of Convocation seems to be tolerably unanimous in thinking that ultra (?) ritualists should give up their 'objectionable practices' in deference to the wishes each of his respective diocesan. Have we to have mere one-sided legislation attempted?"—"A Devon Priest." *Ibid.*, March 3, p. 71.

"For my part, I believe thoroughly and heartily that the work (ritualism) is of God; (???) and if that be so, neither minatory allusions to 'declaratory acts,' nor episcopal repression . . . can stop it."—"Catholicus." *Ibid.*

This is spoken against them as a body. Let us see now their respect to individuals:

"Aiming to please both parties, and carefully hedging with that intent, Dr. Wilberforce has shown his customary oblivion of the trite proverb touching two stools. The ritualists need apprehend nothing from the Bishop of Oxford, once they get the public on their side."—*Ibid.*, Feb. 17, p. 57.

"Doctor Jackson's reply reminds one of the story of the Eton headmaster, who, by an unhappy mistake, sent up for flogging the list of boys who had qualified themselves for confirmation. Only there is no mistake in this instance, for the Bishop (Lincoln) obviously intends the castigation of the good boys, and lets the demireps go free."—*Ibid.*, March 3, p. 69.

"If the Bishop of London is inclined to run amuck at Catholic (??) faith and Catholic (??) workings, by all means let him do so. Who is this awful despot, this terrible Turk, this Pope *in posse*, who is ready

the respect and obedience due to those who, you say, have been ordained and set over you by God? Is rebellion against bishops the best characteristic with you, Dr. Pusey and your party, of fitness for promoting union with Rome? If such is the case, I can only wish that you may speedily succeed in your project; for Rome, let me tell you, knows far better than Canterbury how to secure obedience, and silence importunate chancleers in her hencoop of the Inquisition.

And here, again, I would ask Pusey why he excludes all the rest of Protestantism from joining in the reunion. Because these Churches have not exactly the form which he has given to his Oxford Pandora? It is truly a bright notion of Pusey's that that only is a Church which accepts his form. So with him Evangelical Churchmen form no true Church! But, my dear Doctor, in order to be a true Christian Church, it is not necessary to believe in the "Catholic Church," as you assert, but only to believe in Christ. Belief in Christ is the Church, or the substance; the form is not the Church, but its accident. In the Church of Christ, faith is the person; the form is only the coat

to cut off all our heads in five minutes (*but have you heads, gentlemen, worthy to be cut off?*) if we provoke him?"—"Rev. Edward Stuart, of St. Mary Magdalene." *Guardian*, Aug. 2, 1865.

"The Bishop of Rochester has, perhaps, been guilty of more foolish acts since his elevation to the Episcopate, than any other prelate within our knowledge. But if what we hear be true, he is not only about to do another silly action, but conjointly with it a contemptibly mean one. Well, let his lordship proceed, and we will promise him he shall receive every attention at our hands."—*Church Times*, March 10, 1866, p. 77.

With these few quotations, chosen after the ritualistic exploits, I dismiss a subject which I consider more worthy of the Old Bailey than the Court of Arches.

which covers it; and with regard to the coat, there need be no question of colour and cut, these being left free, and therefore indifferent. If belonging to the vine, whether higher or lower, whether a thick or a thin branch, whether with few or many leaves, it is all the vine. So when any one believes in Christ, he is a Christian, whatever the form he chooses to adopt. Is it your cap and gown which make you Professor of Hebrew at Oxford? Certainly not; but your knowledge of that language. Even without cap and gown you would still be professor of Hebrew, the cap and gown being only distinctive of the professorate, and not the professorate itself. And thus all, in every country, who know Hebrew as well as you, may be called Hebraists, and be professors in their own colleges, without having the cap and gown of Oxford. The same may be said, Dr. Pusey, of all who believe in Jesus Christ, who are individually Christians and collectively a Christian Church, even without having the Church's form about which you rave.

A scheme for the reunion of Christendom, then, which excludes so large a part of Christendom, and limits the action and, in a great measure, the benefits of the undertaking to three Churches, can be no other than an hallucination.

V.

WHY?

What object is to be gained by promoting this union of exclusivists? Does any peril menace the true and

universal Church of Christ so as to render it necessary that some of its branches—even supposing them to be legitimate branches—should unite themselves together in a Roman fasciculus to wield the axe of extermination against the error? Even allowing that Christianity was in danger, could error be overcome and Christianity preserved by the reunion of the three Greek, Roman, and Anglican Churches? I give a negative answer to this double question. I think the Church runs no risk whatever, since “the gates of hell shall never prevail against it;”* and I think that if even human means were necessary for its defence, and were chosen by God to preserve it from danger, this would impart no right to three single Churches to arrogate to themselves its defence, and proudly and contemptuously declare all others useless or incompetent. I will prove my double negative.

Dr. Pusey assigns the battle against rationalism as the main aim of the reunion. According to him, rationalism is a monster which will prevail, unless the three Churches unite. This shows either little faith in the promise of Christ, or else much individual arrogance. As one of those who have fought, and, with God’s help, shall continue to fight, especially in my own Italy, I aver that rationalism is, without doubt, the most hostile and, in some respects, the most dangerous foe which, from Celsus to Voltaire, has ever attacked the Church of Christ. Its appeal to reason gives it an air of plausibility which enables it but too easily to insinuate itself with human pride, and secure a numerous host of distinguished followers.

* Matt. xvi. 18.

But, in spite of it, the truth which exists in the Church of Christ will triumph over all cavil and sophistry. In its own time, the Church will, by the lightning flash of its evangelical glance, prostrate this enemy too, which will earnestly beg and supplicate for reconciliation.

Our contemporary rationalism is neither more subtle nor more daring in its blasphemy than the Voltairianism of the past century, yet to overcome the latter the Church had no need of reunion. Though Rome, Moscow, and Canterbury maintained their isolation, Voltairianism was overcome, like all the errors which had preceded it, and the truth of the Gospel triumphed once more upon the ruins of a lying philosophy. And so it will be eventually with rationalism, which will disappear the sooner the less importance is attached to it, and in proportion as it is individually withstood by the zeal of all the Churches of Christianity. In this respect the conduct of Father Hyacinthe appears to me praiseworthy. From the pulpit of Notre Dame, at Paris, he asks not for union with Protestantism in order to oppose the school of Strauss and Renan, but simply begs that Protestantism, on its side, will oppose rationalism, which, thus attacked on every side and wounded by a thousand arrows, must eventually succumb.

The EIRENICON says, "Let us secure union, and the conflict with rationalism will be incalculably easier." I deny the assertion. Rationalism is, in substance, nothing else than incredulity in a mask of reason. You, Doctor, with utter want of charity and logic, assert that rationalism was given to us by Lu-

theranism, as Socinianism was given us by Calvinism. This simply proves to me that, even in Oxford, the well-known sophism of the *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, may be forgotten. But, allowing, by way of hypothesis, that such is the fact, then permit me, as better acquainted with the history of the Church of the Popes than you, to say that Romanism has always produced atheism and incredulity, which certainly are not the best army with which to combat rationalism. So that, must I for a moment admit that any Church in particular has a special mission to fight against rationalism, I should be obliged instantly to add—only on the condition that it is not united to the Church of Rome.

It is unnecessary that I pause here to prove a truth which leaves no room for cavil—that, as a rule, the effect of the Romish Church is to generate incredulity, for the simple reason that the more laws are multiplied the less they are observed; and the more absurd the dogmas of a Church, the fewer those who believe in them. This is the cause of the practical incredulity among Roman Catholics, especially on the European continent, where, as a general rule, nine out of ten are, to all intents, unbelievers. Hence every one who reasons wisely and discreetly must conclude that not only would union with the Church of Rome not tend to remedy rationalism, but that, in order to conquer it, it is necessary to remain separate.

When I reflect upon the divine Redeemer's question, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?"* and when, on the other hand,

* Luke xviii. 8.

I see the efforts of Rome to win the whole world to its apostasy, I am compelled to conclude that the instrumentality for spreading atheism throughout the world will be the Church of Rome. Therefore the desire to unite with her is a desire to co-operate in the spread of infidelity among the nations before the second coming of Christ. Pusey himself foresees that this will befall, on account of papistical mariolatry (p. 258). Is it not, then, an hallucination, on his part, to propose union with a Church destined to bring forth such an abomination? Does not Christ command us to come out from it, if we would be numbered with the elect few who will be found faithful at the coming of Christ and his saints?

Having demonstrated that the combating of rationalism is not a reason for promoting the union of the two Churches, and that, so far as this object is concerned, it should be avoided by every man, it will be well for us to seek elsewhere for a reason. At § 1 of this chapter we have spoken of Anglican ultramontaniam as the author of this monstrous reunion.* Being so near Rome as it is in doctrine, discipline, and practice, it is but natural that it should imagine the union to be easy of accomplishment, and that it should desire to seek and promote it. The object of the EIRENICON, then, is the gratification of this fanatical sect, whose extravagances

* That there exists an impudent ultramontaniam in the Anglican Church, it can be argued even from their own writings. I quote on the subject a very respectable authority belonging to this *happy* family. "The remarks which are made upon the Establishment at the beginning of the article (*Union Review*) are not in good taste, and their tone too much resembles that of ultramontanians in speaking of the Church of England."—*Church Times*, March 17, 1866, p. 86.

and ascetic aberrations sadden and divide the Church which the martyrs of the Reformation prepared for England in their separation from Rome. In this manner would Papist Oxford, which formerly burnt the Reformers on the pile of its Inquisition, now destroy their work in the school of its apostasy.

Since Dr. Pusey offers himself unasked as the promoter of this union, it may not be out of place to trace the *why* out of his own individual position. I do not suspect; I judge. Suspicion appertains to malevolence, judgment to knowledge; and I shall form my judgment in accordance with the divine precept, to judge of men by their fruits. The actual position of Dr. Pusey is not enviable. I think I do not calumniate him in saying that, attached by conscience and celebrity to his English Church, of which he was the chosen champion to defend it against the attack of the *Essays and Reviews*, he does not desire to abandon it for Rome. But, on the other hand (I hope I do not calumniate him), nature, inclination, sentiment, study, association with apostates, and examples of apostasy, force him, in spite of himself (I trust I do not wrong him), towards the intoxicating cup of the Mother of Harlots. How is he to act between conscience and felony? The way, if not easy, is at least ingenious and happily chosen. If the reunion could take place, as the English Church, according to its own terms and conditions, must remain the Anglican Church, as the French Church remained Gallican, so Dr. Pusey, having effected the union, would remain a clergyman of the English Church, and, at the same time, would be-

come a priest of the Roman Church—at Oxford in surplice and hood, at Rome in vestment and cope, and at both the poet-laureate of peace, the EIRENICOS in apotheosis. As, however, we do not live in countries where, for the gratification of a defunct despot, thousands of vassals are made away with, in order that they may serve their master as cooks and barbers in the world where there is no eating and no hair-cutting, so the scheme of Pusey, which could serve for nothing but to rescue an individual or a sect from an equivocal position, must be looked upon as a scheme of personal egotism rather than of charity. We recommend it, therefore, to fishmongers and tobacconists, that they may make what use they think best of it, only on condition that the true English Church shall never again hear it mentioned.

Those who imagine that I calumniate Pusey in thus judging him, prove their ignorance of the expressions made use of by the pious Doctor when he laments that Oakley and Newman disconcerted the plan of the sect by passing over to Rome too soon. The plan of the sect, then, was clearly to go over to Rome, but gently and gradually, in order to draw the English Church insensibly away with them. The true and original plan, then, is not the reunion of the two Churches (to which, perhaps, Manning alludes in his reproof to Pusey),* but the absolute Romanization of the English Church and its complete absorption into the Roman. The scheme of reunion, then, is not sincere—unless as a superla-

* Eirenicon, p. 4.

tive hallucination—and can be nothing else than a trap to ensnare England, with a view to make her the prey of the Vatican. The object, then, of the EIRENICON is not real; and the true aim (when divested of all its meretricious eloquence) is no other than to replace England under the fatal authority of the Popes of execrable memory.

That such is the design of Pusey and his party, may be readily inferred from the crafty insinuation (p. 66) that the English Church has never rejected the supremacy of a visible head; that is, the supremacy of the Pope. True, Pusey would rebel against this supremacy in the circumstance of the appeals; but it appears that he would yield his adhesion to every other dogmatic or disciplinary claim, however exorbitant. And that he is indoctrinated with this spirit of ecclesiastical authority is proved by the “holy obedience,” or blind brute obedience, imposed by him in his monasteries.

Now, this supremacy of the Popes, this foreign ecclesiastical authority in England, is essentially un-English, and diametrically opposed to English liberty, not only religious but civil. Let the Churchman who may read this reflect for a moment that the sister Church of Ireland was never more noble, more pure, more rich in holy men, especially bishops, than when disconnected from Rome, and with nothing to do with the Popes. Let him reflect, moreover, upon the virgin simplicity of the English Church before the unfortunate arrival of the monk Augustine, who, in the name of Gregory the Great, brought over that insolent Papal dominion which reached its height under

the Anselmos, the Thomases of Canterbury, the Pandolphuses, the Beatons, and the Pooles of Roman execration, and which it cost the King and Parliament so much to restrain.

But laying aside every other consideration respecting this intrusive authority in ecclesiastical affairs, and giving a single glance at its civil aspect, the English reader will see what would be the fate of his country with regard to the development of all honest civil liberty, by observing what has happened in Spain, Belgium, and, above all, in Italy, where every forward step in civilization and progress involves excommunication, or at least a comminatory from Rome.

So that, in reality, the people can only progress in constitutional liberty by ignoring the threats and excommunications of the old prostitute of the Seven Hills. No great encouragement this to England to seek for the reunion!

Should the Roman Church ever regain its former ascendancy by means of reunion, the English would most assuredly exchange the precious inheritance of their most valuable constitutional right, the *Habeas Corpus*, for the benefits of the Inquisition. Romanism without Inquisition is a paradox, and Inquisition and *Habeas Corpus* is a contradiction in terms, and utterly impossible in practice. Laud attempted to reconcile the two things in his day, and finished with the block. At the present day, we should be glad to see the EIRENICON take its place on the block, that its author might assist, like an old Præfica, at its obsequies.

Seeing that matters stand thus, the conclusion is easily reached, that, if the object of the *EIRENICON* is to help Dr. Pusey out of an embarrassment, it is mere childish egotism ; if it is to gratify the pitiful aspirations of ultramontane Churchmen, then it is neither more nor less than shameless sectarianism ; if it is to combat and overcome rationalism, by means of reunion with Rome, then it is nothing else than a sophisticated hallucination.

VI.

How ?

While the entire scheme of reunion is an hallucination and aberration, the part of it which exceeds the rest in absurdity is the manner or the *how* with which the Oxford Doctor thinks of accomplishing it. The *how* proposed and hoped by the leader of Tractarianism is something worse than paradoxical—it is the absurd in logic, the harmony of discord, the embrace of the antipodes, the amalgamation of salts and alkalis—the impossible.

That which is proposed and hoped is, that the Church of Rome will condescend to accept terms from the English Church, and, while allowing it to retain its individual peculiarities, recognise it as a legitimate sister, banquet with it at the Lord's table, and suffer the pulpits and altars of the two Churches to be common to both. This is, at least, what Rome has understood from all this Puseyite movement, as

proved by the letter of Cardinal Patrizi, in reply to the Unionists. It is expressly said: "*Tres enumeratæ communionēs integræ et in sua quæque persuasione persistentes simul in unum coeant.*"* From which it would follow that there is to be an Anglican Roman Catholic Church, as there was already a Gallican Roman Catholic Church. Now, in this there is a radical hallucination which seems to me incurable, even though as large a quantity of hellebore should be administered to Oxford as coals enters Newcastle.

It is true that attempts are made to render this agreement plausible in appearance, by proposing to the Church of Rome to descend somewhat from its height of apostasy, and to the English Church to raise itself a little from the degradation of the Reformation. But, supposing for a moment the possibility of this insane hypothesis, both Churches would lose their special characteristics, thanks to which, the one is at the present day the Church of Rome, and the other the Church of England. Therefore, should the union succeed, the one would be no longer the Roman Church, the other no longer the Anglican Church, according to the terms of their respective designation, but would together become a kind of infusion or syrup of mallows in a decoction of poppies. In fact, if the English Church must raise itself so much, in order to meet Rome on equal ground, it would have to abandon a great portion of those doctrines and practices which make it the Anglican Church, and by reason of which it was formerly excommunicated by Rome, and is still held by Rome to be an heretical Church. In

* Pat. Ep., Nov. 1865.

such case, where would be the individuality, longed for by Pusey, of an Anglican Church entire, and established in its own persuasion? Would not the union, in this sense, be fatal to the very existence of the English Church?

The case of the Gallican Church is so different, that I can but marvel how it could ever have entered the mind and emerged from the pen of so learned a controversialist. The Gallican Church, at the time of the five famous propositions of Bossuet, was a Roman Catholic Church, nor did it cease for an instant, on account of these five propositions, to be such. The said propositions in no way touched the Papal dogma and Sacramentalism, but were simply a national modification of canons and discipline which Rome might tolerate in its eldest daughter, but which has ever produced a certain ill feeling between them, and which, at the present day, is fast disappearing under the formidable pertinacity and the underhand arts of French ultramontanism. This proves how unwilling Rome always is to adapt itself to the conditions of others, even in questions of secondary importance, or indeed of no importance whatever.

But in our case the question is one of the first order, and one of first-rate importance. Whether we will or no, it is a question of dogma and of practice; a question of existence or non-existence. The English Church is, at present, a Church divided from Rome, and divided in consequence of substantial differences of doctrine and form; so that it must either renounce these differences, by which alone it is the English Church, and can remain such, or it must renounce

the union with Rome, which can be no party to these differences, and in no respect approves them.

On the other hand, with regard to the Pusey proposition, will Rome descend from her height of pretensions and apostasy in order to meet and effect a compromise with her erring English daughter? It needs a large dose of simplicity to believe such a thing. If Rome, by an impossibility, should descend to such an agreement, it would commit suicide. Not only would it cease *de facto* to be the Church of infallibility, but it would for ever renounce the *non possumus* of its immutability, and would, consequently, cease to be the Roman Church. The double proposition is but too natural.

A Church which calls itself infallible, and accepts the conditions of heresy, loses, *ipso facto*, its claim to infallibility; and a Church which modifies its statutes and its system to please any party, can boast of immutability no more than the waves of the ocean, which never remain fixed to the same spot. And even worse: the Roman Church would thus afford a precedent which would certainly lead to its ruin. If, in the course of time, another triad, like Oakley, Newman, and Pusey, should Tractarianize the Lutheranism of Germany, the Calvinism of France, and so on, and these Churches should ask for union with Rome on their own terms, as already conceded to the Anglican Church, and Rome were obliged to consent for fear of compromising itself by refusal, it must cease, as the consequence of concession after concession, to possess any distinctive traits of its own, and would become a mere mosaic of Anglicanism, Lu-

theranism, Calvinism, and various similar *isms* — a specimen for a museum, and a riddle for archæological *dilettanti*. As it is, it has a distinctive character and garment. The Mother of Harlots wraps itself up in its mantle dyed red in the blood of the saints, sacrificed by fanaticism on the altar of the Inquisition. But if Pusey's propositions were listened to, it would find in the Oxford wardrobe a harlequin's coat that would render it the object of scorn and contempt to its most devoted admirers.

To this the Church of Rome will never consent voluntarily; never will it yield to these demands. If Rome itself asked for union, and desired it at any cost, it might then be hoped that she would offer conditions that could be accepted. But when others seek it, they must, of course, submit to the conditions of Rome. I speak emphatically, that I may be the more clearly understood. If Pusey and his party seek for reunion with Rome, and think, at the same time, of dictating conditions, in that case, I say, there is no lunatic asylum capable of receiving and curing them. Gentlemen, the servant who seeks to enter the establishment, and accept the pay of a master, must submit to the conditions imposed by the master; and the blockhead who kneels to a priest for absolution, must submit to the penance imposed upon him. It is not to be expected that either master or confessor will submit to conditions imposed by those who solicit their favours.

And so it must be in this case. If the English Church asks to be allowed to unite with Rome, it must receive from the latter the conditions of union;

and this is a *conditio sine quâ non*. Does Dr. Pusey think that Rome would yield to the remonstrances of the Anglican Church? It is not she who wishes to come to you, but you who wish to go to her; you must, therefore, receive the reunion at her hands, and you will certainly receive it only upon her conditions. Now, as the Roman Church never changes, neither can nor will change to please you, therefore it is for you to change and un-Anglicize yourselves to become Romanists. Such are her conditions, and it is impossible they could be other than these. Heretics as you are in the eyes of Rome, what arrogance is it on your part to say to the *Mater et Magistra omnium Ecclesiarum*, this or nothing! Was it ever seen that a discomfited, routed, defeated army was permitted to dictate the conditions of peace to its warlike conquerors? There can be no peace except upon the victor's own conditions. And so it is with you Anglican ultramontanists. You foolishly think you may get off with a somerset, when Rome has seized you by the hair of your head. You think it is quite enough to promise Rome that you will cease to hate and contradict her; but Rome tells you, in the politest fashion, that you are a pack of visionaries, and that the only way to effect the reunion is by ceasing to be Anglicans and becoming Papists. Believe it on the assertion of Cardinal Patrizi, who intones it for your benefit in a true Gregorian chant, unaccompanied by hypocrisy;—*Neque ad optatissimam hanc intercommunionem restaurandam satis esse similitates et odia in Romanam Ecclesiam deponere sed omnino ex*

præcepto et instituto Christi oportere Romanæ Ecclesiæ fidem et communionem amplecti." *

Is it possible that Rome would condescend to make conditions with the English Church with a view to the good that would result from their union? Utopians hope so, but their hopes are vain. Three centuries ago, efforts were made to bring Rome to agreement with Luther, in order to avoid the great evils which schism would bring upon the Church. If the Church would not then listen to any accommodation, and, in the very presence of the schism, excommunicated both Reformers and Reformation, is she likely to come to an agreement with the English Church now upon the pretext of the good which might result from their union? What a gross hallucination is this!

In the first place, what is this great advantage? A castle in the air, a soap-bubble! Secondly, where is the English Church? In the homœopathic fraction of Oxford, a Tom Thumb of Anglicanism. So long as the great mass of Churchmen not only do not ask for the union, but oppose it with all their might, what is to be said of the great good which would result from it? It would be a repetition of the *parturient montes nascitur ridiculus mus*. All the great Catholic good would resolve itself simply into the Romish Catholicity of a Lilliputian party, for union with which Rome well knows that there is no need of agreements.

Rome bides her time. She prays, she says, for the wandering sons; but, meanwhile, seduces and corrupts

* Epist. Ibid.

them, certain that they will return to her unconditionally, thanks to her meretricious arts and the perfidy of her Jesuits.

This is precisely the condition of Puseyism. Rome would cease to be wise in her generation if she came to an agreement with the Puseyite party to facilitate the union, while it is known perfectly well in Rome, even better than in Oxford, that this party is desirous of uniting with Rome, no matter at what cost; which means, without insisting upon the acceptance of its conditions, but with perfect willingness to receive blindly those of the ancient Mother.

It seems to me that Dr. Pusey positively ignores two things most essential at this point of the controversy. The first is, that Tractarianism owes its origin wholly and exclusively to Rome. This plan of surreptitiously attacking England and gradually perverting her, by poisoning one of the theological fountains of national wisdom, in order that the venom should subsequently spread to the remotest districts, is a Papistical stratagem prepared in Rome years ago with diabolical ingenuity, and silently followed out by Jesuits of every grade, in the hands of whom the English founders of Tractarianism, our Doctor included, are but puppets managed by the Vatican according to its pleasure.

The second is, that while he, the founder of Puseyism, is deceived—I say deceived, but others should accuse him of being the deceiver—to such an extent as to propose the union of the Churches, each to retain its own nature, individuality, and characteristics, his party, either more sincere or more daring,

demands the union unconditionally, and feels holy horror at the thought that any one can suspect it of being infected with the anti-Catholic vanity of Anglican individualism. Here we see the same thing befall Puseyism which formerly befel Epicureanism and Calvinism, the followers and disciples of which strangely changed the doctrines of their masters. Now that the Puseyitic dreamers of reunion are at the antipodes from Pusey as to the condition of Anglicanism to be retained in the English Church in the act of union, the Doctor himself might be convinced by what I read in the barbarous Latin answer which they gave to the Cardinal's letter. Among other un-English impertinences stands the following explicit sentence: "*Longe a nobis et a societate nostra tale propositum ex quo non unitas ecclesiastica sed discordia fratrum sub eodem tectu comminus pugnantium foret speranda.*" *

Hence it follows that Rome, by whom the appearance and growth of Puseyism was brought to its actual state of impudence, knows full well that its bastard child is ripe for union, and desires it at all costs, intoxicated as it is with the cup of its Holy Harlot Mother. Yet Rome will never be so senseless as to accept conditions from those who are already anxiously, and indeed impatiently, waiting to accept hers. Thus the great good which the Doctor expects from this reunion resembles the hallucination of the boy who thought he had the whole ocean in his hand when he collected a spoonful of water in a nutshell.

The mode, then, of the reunion proposed by Pusey

* *Union Review*, No. XIX.

is nothing else than superlative hallucination, since Rome will never be brought to accept the conditions of union from the English Church. Poor Pusey and poor Puseyites ! in the eyes of Rome you are nothing more than stubble and firewood, with all your Anglican Catholicism. There is no other way of safety for you than to imitate your dear brother Ignatius, and in sackcloth, with girdle about your loins, and bare feet, beating your breast in sign of penitence, throw yourself headforemost upon the Roman Pontiff's slipper, kiss it devoutly, and humbly ask it to bestow a kick upon you, that you may enter the sanctuary catholically in order to become stones in the edifice which is founded upon Peter—" *Venite fratres si vultis ut inseramini in vite (Petrus) dolor est cum vos videmus præcisos ita jacere.*"*

Go—go in this guise to the Mother who will restore you to all the benefits of Catholic mediævalism. To go otherwise, or according to the conditions proposed by the EIRENICON, would be to add insult to rebellion.

VII.

WHEN ?

In order to crown the scheme of hallucination erected by our Doctor, nothing was wanted but to fix the time for the long-desired reunion. According to Dr. Pusey, the present is the best time possible.

The first reason adduced by him in proof of this is

* Card. Patrizi's Letter.

that, as the present is the time of the great warfare, so should it be also that of the great reunion. Unfortunately, Pusey himself destroys the force of this argument by asseverating (p. 285) that the battle is but temporary. It cannot be worth the trouble, then, of effecting a lasting union between two enemies solely for the purpose of combating a third, which, while it might be overcome by either of the combatants alone without the aid of the other, is in itself so transitory that it may probably disappear pending the preliminaries of union.

I have elsewhere proved (§. 5) that, in order to combat rationalism, reunion with Rome is not only not desirable, but that, on the contrary, it is better that the Churches should remain separate ; and this is sufficient to show that neither now nor at any future time ought such a reunion to take place, unless the English Church desires to make common cause with the apostasy of Rome.

Now, this would be contrary to the assurance which Dr. Pusey gives us with regard to the spirit which is seen at the present day to be reviving in the Church of England (p. 281). If his proposition is to be accepted in an absolute and legitimate sense, it would prove one of two things—either that Dr. Pusey is wanting in logic or in charity when he treats Protestantism as an institution dead in the eyes of God. His words upon the point are so precious I can but quote them : “The unbelief in Holland, the rationalism in Germany, the Socinianism at Geneva, the Arianism or semi-Arianism prevalent among the French Calvinists, the universalism which is desolating

the United States" (p. 11)—all this heresy among "Protestant bodies" has arisen in consequence of their distance from the English Church; and if there is anything good among the English "Dissenters," it is very much owing, under the mercy of God, to the English Church, which enfolds them all around while they are hostile to it (pp. 11, 12).

Now, let us discuss this. If your Church is reviving at the present day, it is a sign that it was dead before, and that by your own admission. But if your Church was dead, how could it preserve to Dissenters that which it did not possess itself? You, Dr. Pusey, who are so quick in discovering the mote in your brother's eye, pray be good enough to tell me what your Church was before its recent revival? What were its ministers when they hurled their intolerance against the Wesleys, the Whitefields, the Romaines, and their glorious companions, because they preached Christ and his Gospel to a people who had all but lost sight of him, in consequence of his not having been preached for years and years? History answers for you, that during a long series of years and generations Anglicanism was synonymous with sporting, hunting, the turf, and spiritual nothingness.

But at length your Church has undergone renewal, reviving to the spirit of the Reformers, and this should logically teach you that even Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Nonconformity may return to the dogmatic purity of the Reformation; indeed, if the English Dissenters have faith in proportion to that of the English Church (and the faith of the latter is reviving at the present day), the only conclusion which can be

reached in an Oxford college must be the revival of the same faith in a proportionate degree among the Dissenters. Is the Lord's hand shortened, or is it restricted to the Anglican Church alone? How gross a want of charity is it on the part of our pious Doctor to class the whole of Protestantism in a bundle as an object of contempt to his ultramontane party, as if unworthy of the least regard, and incapable of forming part of the Christian family! If it has its errors, imitate Christ, who came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance.* The same grace which, according to your assertion, has caused the revival of faith to an hitherto unequalled extent in your Church, will also cause this faith to revive in other Protestant communions, and produce the most beautiful union which can ever take place, and which will, above all things, rejoice the angels in heaven.†

And here, continuing to admit that the English Church is truly in a state of salutary revival, I would ask if that is a reason why the living should join itself to the dead, precisely at the moment that the living is in the most flourishing state, and the dead in the most corrupt? If the English Church is, in truth, reviving to its ancient spirit, and has so revived by itself, it ought to remain by itself. To unite itself with Rome is not only suicide, but condemnation. When it possessed a like spirit in the days of its martyrs, why did it separate from Rome? On account of her corruptions. Have these corruptions been removed or reformed? No. To reunite itself

* Luke xix. 10.

† Luke xv. 10.

with her, then, would be to give the lie to the Reformers as to the necessity of separating from Rome, and to condemn itself as the abettor and friend of corruption.

But it is time that I should quit the region of concessions, and enter that of doubt as to the spiritual devotion which, at the present day, reigns in the English Church, and is inspiring her with new life, at least so far as the ultramontaniam of the Puseyite party is concerned. The spirit which is reviving in this party is certainly not the spirit of the Gospel, but of the Tridentine. It is not the life of the Church, but of the theatre. Its ritualism in itself and in its tendencies is not spirit, but merely the appearance of it; it is not life, but a mere galvanic imitation. It is not the apostolic age which the Puseyites seek to restore to England, but the barbarous pomp of mediævalism, as best adapted to charm the multitude, which neither does nor can reason. All the gorgeous ceremonialism of this party is merely a second edition of the serpent's arts in Eden, when Satan, under a pleasing aspect, brought "sin into the world, and death by sin." This and nothing else is the object which he seeks to attain, at the present time, by means of the rich masquerades of the ritualists; and when these, in accordance with the rules of the *Directorium Anglicanum*, have passed through all the grades of processions, genuflexions, bowings, and bendings, they have done nothing more than give a specimen of military evolutions adapted, perhaps, to charm the eyes of stupid spectators, but utterly incapable of

turning the heart to salvation. In a word, all that the Puseyism of the present day teaches in its schools and practises in its churches, so far from being the life of the soul, is the mere gratification of the senses—an artificial piety, a mechanical religion, an automaton faith. And this you consider the spirit in which a Church calling itself the Church of Christ, should live? Conscious as I am of the truth of the assertion, “the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light,” * I shall not suffer myself to be seduced into changing my opinion respecting this fatal Anglican ultramontaniam by a certain amount of tinsel, zeal, and spurious charity, boldly paraded by its members before the eyes of the inexperienced. Even supposing the zeal and charity of the party to be real, the object to which they are directed—the apostasy of England—would be quite sufficient to pervert them. According to the Jesuitical maxim, the end sanctifies the vilest means; but here, on the contrary, though the means are holy, they are altogether perverted by the vileness of the end—apostasy. I am consoled, however, by the reflection that even hypocrisy has its limits, and that, though the Anglican ultramontanists seek to impose upon the ignorant by an over-dose of zeal and charity, yet the truthful maxim of the immortal bard is not forgotten in England—“All that glitters is not gold.”

Certainly, the Church that revives to such a spirit is likely to seek to reunite itself with Rome; it is but too natural that her meretricious daughters

* Luke xvi. 8.

should love the Mother of Harlots. It must also be admitted, that if one period ever was more appropriate than another for reunion with Rome the present is that period, when Puseyite ritualism and ceremonialism have attained their culminating point. I deny, however, that this would be the union of the Church of England with the Roman Church. It would be nothing more than the union with Rome of the Tractarianism of Oxford, which belongs to Rome entirely by origin, alliance, and affinity, and which is, in fact, a Roman Church in a Protestant disguise.

In another view of the case, however, the time chosen by Pusey for reunion with Rome could never have been more inopportune and disastrous. He proposes reunion with Rome when Rome, on her part, has defined *de fide* the dogma of the immaculate conception of Mary. Now, as there is no doctrine more Pagan, more antisciptural, more sacrilegiously blasphemous than the declaration that a simple creature born of Adam is exempt from the sin common to all the children of Adam, so to propose to unite with a Church which declares *de fide* the most audacious blasphemy that ever was uttered against the immaculate conception of Christ God-Man, can be nothing else than perfidy or hallucination.

Pusey himself demonstrates the inadmissibility of this miserable dogma in more than a hundred pages of the EIRENICON. With what logic, then, with what spirit, can he propose reunion with a Church which has so recently made this wicked doctrine an article of faith? I shall not here enter into the sub-

ject, as I shall have to discuss it elsewhere : I simply ask, can the English Church accept this blasphemous dogma? No. Will the Church of Rome renounce it for the sake of reunion? No. Is it possible to effect a compromise upon a subject of primary importance like this? No. Then a worse time could not have been chosen for proposing the union, and I thank God for it.

It is an ancient proverb, *Quos vult perdere Deus prius dementat*. The scheme of Pusey and his party can but be abomination in the sight of God in the actual condition of the two Churches. That he may frustrate and bring it to nought, should be the prayer of all hearts sincerely Christian. He has blinded the mental vision (*dementat*) of the leader of the party, who himself furnishes the weapons for the complete demolition of his own edifice. The impossibility of the scheme proves better than any argument the hallucination of the Doctor. And again I thank God for it. Let us, then, conclude the chapter with a brief

SUMMARY.

It is an hallucination that Puseyistic ultramontanism should propose the reunion. **WHO?**

It is an hallucination that the reunion should be proposed between three Churches only. **WHAT?**

It is an hallucination that the proposed reunion should emanate from England, or rather from Oxford. **WHERE?**

It is an hallucination that Protestantism, neither domestic nor foreign, should participate in the reunion. **WITH?**

It is an hallucination to believe that by the reunion alone can rationalism be overcome. **WHY?**

It is an hallucination to look for the reunion on the ground of the possibility of harmonizing contraries. **How?**

It is an hallucination to desire the reunion on the appearance of a new heresy. **WHEN?**

The hallucination being proved, nothing but the most obstinate blindness could suffer itself to be led by such an authority into reunion with Rome. English Christians will not forget upon occasion to apply to this fatal **EIRENICON** the divine saying of Jesus, "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch."

CHAPTER II.

THE FALLACY.

THE most important point of the EIRENICON—or, rather, I would say, the only important point—since, when once this has been proved fallacious, the whole fabric of the EIRENICON naturally falls of itself, like the lines of soldiers which children make with playing cards, and which, when one is touched, all fall one after the other to the very last—this single point of importance is the feigned persuasion of Dr. Pusey with regard to the harmony existing between the Articles of the Prayer Book and the decrees of the Council of Trent. That he has impregnated all the men of his party with this feigned persuasion is seen in their writings, especially subsequent to the EIRENICON, which, according to them, was the pioneer in this sublime discovery.* In order to render this feigned persuasion still more conspicuous, the Oxford professor

* *Union Review*, p. 3.

has chosen to confide it to Roman Catholics in a letter, dated November 22, 1865, and addressed by him to their well-known organ, the *Weekly Register*. I shall quote this letter as a *chef-d'œuvre* of sectarian fallacy, in order, by its means, to place the controversy upon its true footing, and shall subsequently, in the right time and place, confute it in detail. Listen, then, to the oracle of the Oxford sphinx: "I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained authoritatively—i.e., by the Romish Church itself, not by individual theologians only. This involves the conviction, on my side, that there is nothing in our Articles which cannot be explained rightly as not contradicting anything held to be *de fide* in the Roman Church."

As every one may see, the oracle is of the nature of the sphinx rather than that of the sybil. The words, *explained authoritatively*, *explained rightly*, may have as many significations and as wide an extent as may be desired. Dr. Pusey pretends ignorance that the consent of Papist theologians forms authority in the Church of Rome; he feigns ignorance that the Church of Rome has explained the Tridentine decrees *authoritatively*, by means of its dogmatic "Roman Catechism;" he appears to be ignorant that the Church has instituted the *congregazione del concilio* for the express purpose of explaining every difficulty and doubt among Catholics which may arise upon the interpretation of the said Tridentine decrees. With regard to the *rightly*, on the part of the English Church, this I find done by the majority of its honest divines,

who have proved (as far as they can do) that the Articles of the Prayer Book, in many points, contradict that which the Romans believe dogmatically *de fide*, and contradict, in everything, that which the theologians complacently term *quasi de fide*, but which the Papists in general believe themselves obliged to believe as if it were really *de fide*. While these two scholastic terms form a distinction under the pen of the theologian, practically, with regard to both Church and people, they are a distinction without a difference.

It may be that, in the opinion of some, this pretended persuasion of Dr. Pusey with regard to the harmony of the Articles and decrees of the two Churches should not be imputed to fallacy; perhaps he desires to express nothing else than that there is no real hostility between the two parties, but that, with a small amount of reciprocal explanation, the hostility would disappear, it being wholly apparent. But all this reasoning reduces itself to mere cavilling, and, indeed, to nothing. The pretended persuasion of Pusey is the harmony between the Articles and the decrees, and hence the possibility of reunion between the two Churches. The English proverb runs, "Set a thief to catch a thief." The best way, then, of proving the feigned persuasion of the learned Doctor is by quoting the opinions formed of it by his panegyrists.* "He holds it to be a mistake to suppose that any of the Thirty-nine Articles were levelled against the doctrines of the Roman communion, as set forth by the Council of Trent, or that the decrees

* *Union Review*, p. 2.

of Trent were levelled against anything upheld by the English Church." *Ergo*, Pusey sees a real and substantial harmony between Articles and decrees; *ergo*, they may be explained to the full satisfaction of both parties without the least alteration; *ergo*, the Roman Church can accept the Articles of the Prayer Book, and the Church of England can accept the decrees of the Tridentine Council without any exception or difficulty; *ergo*, the reunion of the two Churches, under these important aspects, is not only practicable, but is already accomplished; *ergo*, Dr. Pusey labours under a feigned persuasion, and is Doctor of fallacy.

With a view to proceed with order and clearness, I shall leave these general assertions of Pusey and his party—which are so general that they say and prove nothing—and shall proceed to demonstrate the opposition made by the Council of Trent to the Articles of the English Church, by the nature, the object, and the history itself of the said council—a radical opposition which exists, in spite of the harmony which may be found in some points of dogma between the two Churches—an opposition which manifests itself in an especial manner from a practical examination of the English Articles side by side with the Tridentine decrees. If all this is epitomized in three words, we have the *impossible*, the *incompatible*, and the *inadmissible*. From these three heads we will prove the fallacy of the EIRENICON and its author.

I.

THE IMPOSSIBLE.

EXAMINATION OF COUNCIL.

In the first place, what is this Tridentine Council which is to take the *vice* of the word of God, to which alone recourse should be had to try the faith of a Church?

It is a council which arrogated to itself the title œcumenical, although the Church was never universally represented in it, often only homœopathically and fractionally, always without the mandate and the co-operation of the people of the faithful, no other motives or agencies having place in it but those of diplomacy and the Papacy.

It is a council which was expected to decree only in accordance with the Pope's wish, and which, in the contrary case, was to be closed forthwith, the Pope having given a public bull to his legates to open it, and a secret one to close it whenever it should come into collision with his interests.

It is a council which was suggested exclusively by the political cunning of Charles V. for his own worldly ends, and of which, in process of time, he availed himself, as of the sword of Damocles, against the Lutheran princes, states, and subjects, against France, and against the ambition of the Popes, according to circumstances; and it is consequently a council anything but holy, or having holy aims.

It is a council which was prepared, assembled, and managed solely by means of intrigue, cabal, intimidation, and political perfidy—elements little compatible

with the boast that its deliberations were made under the inspiration and direction of the Holy Spirit.

It is a council which, while its sole aim was the establishment of its own authority and that of the people it represented, used the Bible as a shield for itself, and with the most insolent audacity prohibited the use of it in the vernacular to Catholics of all countries, and presented it to them in the altered and corrupted form of the Vulgate.

It is a council which, in order the more effectually to throw discredit upon the Bible and establish the most absurd and baneful doctrines, had recourse to tradition, to which it gave equal or higher value, and often greater authority, than to the word of God itself, although the traditions cited by it were generally an *incognita*, or, indeed, the pure invention of its manufactory.

It is a council which, far from being anxious to arrive at the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, sought only to establish the errors of the Catholic Church by giving them an appearance of holiness and a little more of dogmatic forms; a council which, frequently unable to obtain agreement and unanimity between its members, its great study was to find terms sufficiently vague and abstruse to content the most opposite parties; so that, for example, in the decree of grace, the council could say *no* with Soto and *yes* with Cattarini.

It is a council which, being unable, scripturally, to confute a single doctrine of the Reformation, decided upon nothing but the confirmation and legalization by its canons of all the errors and all the abuses

already existing in the Roman Church, and which had brought about the Reformation. It gave nothing new to the Catholic world voluntarily, excepting the ferocity of its charity in its violent and repeated anathemas against everything not Papistic.

And it is by means of this council that Dr. Pusey seeks to ingratiate himself with Rome, and tries to prove that the English Church must be Catholic because its Articles are almost wholly in accordance with the decrees of this precious council! It would be a shame if such were the case; and if it is not the case, shame upon those who dare to assert that it is!

But, even had the Council of Trent been a true and holy council, still I would never take it as the basis of reunion. The Bible, and the Bible alone, should be the basis, since the Bible alone forms the rule of faith through which exclusively can "the unity of the spirit" be attained.

The above observations upon the Tridentine Council are quite sufficient to prove the disagreement which must necessarily exist between it and the Prayer Book. The nature of the latter proves the holiness of the intention of those who commanded it, the holiness of the men who compiled it, the holiness of the means adopted for its compilation so far as was compatible with the times, and the fact that those concerned had but just emerged from Romanism, and had to strive against it with the majority of the people. But more than all, I would point out the object to which the Prayer Book was directed. This was the sanctification of the English Church and people by means of their return to primitive Christi-

anity. I shall not here inquire whether this object was attained, or whether it could be attained by such means. It is sufficient for my argument that such was the object to prove the necessary discord between its Articles and the decrees of the Council of Trent.

Let us now see with what object the council was held. The Tridentine Council, like many another institution of the Roman Church, is a species of double-headed Janus, which presents two totally different aspects. The real instigator and promoter of the council was Charles V. Now this Catholic despot—despotic even in his bigotry—insisted with three successive Popes upon the assembling of an œcumenical council only to obtain the reform of the abuses of the Roman Church, which alone had caused the Reformation of Luther. In this the fanatical Cæsar acted logically. It was politically impossible that he could impose silence with regard to Lutheranism in his empire, and still less condemn its followers, while the reasons which justified the Lutheran schism still existed in the Roman Church.

The Pope, on his side, however, while he languidly admitted the existence of such abuses, was unwilling to undertake to remedy them by means of a general council. The abuses should be taken into consideration, but their removal should not be the primary motive of the assembly. The object of the Pope in assembling the council was principally, nay, indeed exclusively, to fulminate his anathemas against the Reformers and the Reformation. Although it is true that these abuses were mentioned in the bull of assembly issued by Paul III., yet the allusion was so

slight that it was smothered and totally lost in the high-sounding terms of the bull itself—the extermination of heresy and the triumph of the Church.

Facts corresponded with the bull. Not only did the council avoid reforming a single dogmatic abuse of the Roman Church, but it condemned all the doctrines of the Reformers which had any relation whatever to such abuses; so that it may be asserted with historical accuracy that they were all approved by it tacitly and inferentially. The object, then, of the Roman Church in the Council of Trent was exclusively the condemnation of the Reformation.

The title Reformation and Reformers was not limited by the Roman Church, as it was by Charles V., to Luther and his companions, but comprehended the Calvinism of France and Switzerland, the Anglicanism of Great Britain, and all the heresy of which it had cognizance on the European continent. It was the mission of the Tridentine Council to combat reformation in general, and this it did, in fact, for everything discussed, decreed, and promulgated by the Fathers, was intended to effect the extirpation of the Reformation. The English Church, in the eyes of Rome, already formed part and parcel of the Reformation; *ergo*, the Tridentine Council, in its discussions, decrees, and promulgations, included the Church of England in its anathemas. Hence the decrees of the said council, both by their inherent nature, and the object to which they were directed, must be contrary to the Articles of the English Church. Of two things one: either the Church of England is not a Reformed Church, and then Pusey contradicts him-

self when he proves (p. 80) that the English Church had a right to reform itself ; or the English Church is a Reformed Church, and then the object of the Tridentine Council was to involve it in the common condemnation of the Reformation. Not even sophistry itself could maintain the contrary. The harmony, then, between Articles and decrees can be nothing but fallacy.

If we now take the history of the Tridentine and of the Prayer Book, the opposition between the Articles and the decrees will appear still more striking.

The Council of Trent was opened in 1545. To do honour to the Holy Spirit of the Papists, it continued its sessions during eighteen years, and was closed in 1563. The first articles of faith of the English Church, forty-two in number, appeared under Edward VI., in 1552. They were reduced to thirty-nine under Elizabeth, and published in 1562. Finally, they were authoritatively issued as revised, and to be altered no more, in 1571.

Let us look closely into these dates, and prove from them the fallacy of the EIRENICON. The council, from its commencement, had an eye towards England. Like those who are frightened, Rome foresaw the battle from afar, long before the time, and prepared for it. I do not date the English Reformation, as certain Papists do, with great want of sincerity, from Henry VIII., who of right belongs to the Papist and not the Protestant communion. Rome, however, well understood that its own misdeeds would arouse the spirit of inquiry and emancipation in Great Britain, that the ugly king would be succeeded by the holy

king, and that the rebellion of the one would be followed by the reformation of the other. This accounts for the watchfulness of the council over the English movement. I assert a historical fact, and not a mere supposition.

When the fears of Trent were realized by the appearance of the first Articles in 1552, the council undertook at once to attack them as directly as it had done the rest of the Reformed confessions. It was still sitting when they reappeared under Elizabeth in 1562, and thus had the opportunity of anathematizing them in its conclusions, and did so. Nor was the ultimate feat of excommunication wanting when Pius IV. issued his *credo* as a compendium of the Tridentine errors against the evangelical dogma of the Reformers. I would call special attention to what I here state. To suppose, in opposition to history, as Pusey does, that the Tridentine Council in its decrees took no notice of the Articles of the English Church, is to suppose either that the Tridentine Fathers were ignorant of the Reform movement of England (and no one with a grain of common sense could believe them capable of such ignorance), or that the Fathers feigned to take no notice of it, passed it over as if it had no existence, and, making a special exception in the case of the Anglican profession of faith, fulminated against it none of the anathemas hurled against the other Protestant professions. No one who is not wilfully blind, with his eyes open could believe it capable of such connivance.

The history, therefore, of the Tridentine decrees proves incontestably that they were issued not only

against the English Church in general, as part of the Reformation, but against its Articles in particular, of which it could and must take cognizance and examine. *Ergo*, the Tridentine decrees being issued to oppose the English Articles, are in their nature incapable of harmonizing with them. That which was decreed by one party to anathematize another, can scarcely have in it the germs and the facilities for orthodox reunion. Reunion then, on such conditions, is a fallacy.

The argument grows beyond measure when looked at from the side of the English Church. The Articles of the latter, substantially condemnatory of the abuses and errors of Rome, were especially characterized by opposition to the Tridentine canons. When they first appeared in 1552, the council had already been sitting seven years, and had decreed Roman doctrines of the first importance through fifteen sessions. In substance, then, the Articles condemned those doctrines. But when they reappeared in 1562, and the council was on the point of being dissolved after having sanctioned the most revolting errors as dogmas, the Articles would not have been Articles at all, or would not have been of the nature of a profession of faith, had they not in every minute particular opposed Tridentine dogmatism. And when they finally became obligatory, without any further revision in 1571, they gave the last blow not only to the council, but to the *credo* of Pius. IV., which was its authoritative corollary. *Ergo*, by their nature, by explicit mandate, and by direct aim, the Articles of the Church of England were declared to be antagonistic to the Tridentine canons.

I have elsewhere demonstrated Pusey's delusion in imagining that the Articles are merely negative and propose nothing positive; which, in other terms, signifies that the English Church of the present day has no profession of faith. Even upon this absurd hypothesis, the Articles would still be in contradiction to the Tridentine decrees, according to the admission of Pusey himself. While they deny what Trent affirms, even though they were not originally drawn up in opposition to the council, they must be allowed to be opposed in fact. Even adopting the theory of negation, logically speaking, the *à removendo* theory, my conclusion remains the same. By force of denial you will arrive at affirmation; by force of *removere* you will arrive at the positive. If the Articles deny what Trent decrees, the decrees of Trent can certainly not enter into the composition of the English Church, and this suffices to prove that there can be no harmony between them. Who, then, can make them harmonize? If the two professions of faith differ *per se et in toto*, if they must necessarily differ, such being their nature, their object, and their history, who could possibly establish reunion upon such terms and upon such bases? Who? Fallacy. But fallacy is not an argument which proves anything; *ergo*, the reunion of the two Churches is impossible.

II.

THE INCOMPATIBLE.

EXAMINATION OF DOCTRINES.

One argument which frequently appears in the *EIRENICON* (pp. 18, 19, 96, &c.), under a variety of forms, and which seems to be a great favourite with Pusey, is the large number of parallel doctrines in the Churches, it being incontestable that the English Church has, in common with Rome, many infallible truths equally based upon infallible authority. I will prove the fallacy resulting from this argument, so far as regards the subject of the reunion.

In the first place, I would request Pusey to observe, even before he reaches the fourth chapter of this answer, that if the fact of having not a few infallible doctrines and truths, in common with other Churches, must be considered a reason for reunion with them, Dr. Pusey might spare himself, at least in the first instance, his archæological study and research upon the Tridentine and its catechism. Had he but consulted the profession of faith of the Countess of Huntingdon, which I believe is employed by the Congregationalists in general—if he would have remembered that of Westminster, which appears to me to be the basis of Presbyterianism and a large portion of Nonconformity—he would have found so many doctrines and infallible truths believed by them in common with his Church, as to have suggested to him the *honesty* of a reunion with these Churches also, or rather with

these Churches sooner than with the Roman, the number of doctrines in common between them being much greater. I will go further. If Dr. Pusey, instead of so complacently abusing Lutheranism as he does, had not forgotten Cardinal Wiseman, quoted by himself (p. 267), who, in giving the opinion of the great Bossuet with regard to the Confession of Augsburg, writes in his letter—"Providence had allowed so much Catholic truth to be preserved in that confession, that full advantage should be taken of the circumstance;" in that case, Pusey might have come to the *Christian* conclusion that, precisely because of "so much Catholic truth," the Church of England has no reason to exclude the Lutheranism of that confession from its reunion.

And this argument of mine may also serve to answer Pusey negatively. For if, notwithstanding the great number of infallible truths and doctrines common to the English Church and Nonconformity at home and to Lutheranism abroad, to which Calvinism might without difficulty be added, he feels a *Catholic* repugnance to unite with these Churches, others might, with great reason, experience the same repugnance to unite with Rome, notwithstanding the infallible truths which the Roman and English Church hold in common.

That the Church of Rome should, like the English Church, hold some infallible truths, need not excite surprise, except among the most bigoted fanatics. Those who belong to no extreme party—and it is my conscientious boast that I am of that number—admit without hesitation that the Church of Rome is one of

the Christian Churches which form the Catholic family of the Redeemer. As a Christian Church, the Church of Rome must retain those fundamental truths which form the dogmatic creed of Christianity, and by the rejection of which it would cease, *de jure et de facto*, to be a Christian Church. On this ground, then, both Churches may easily meet, although without perfect similarity; in the same manner that the white man and the negro now meet on a level of liberty in the capitol of Washington, both being human creatures, and belonging to the same Father. Their colour, however, is different, and in this respect no law, nor will, nor sympathy can ever make them equal. But we must not anticipate the proof.

It is, then, an error to believe that Rome holds none of the great truths which save, and is consequently a Church of perdition. Where the confession and the love of Christ exist in sincerity, there can be no damnation. I therefore do not deny the veracity of the ancient axiom, that all salutary truths have proceeded from Rome, especially for the post-apostolic conversion of the West; but I demand that the second part of the axiom be also accepted, and, according to it, all errors of dogma, doctrine, and discipline also came from Rome. And here is the true and intrinsic reason of the opposition made to her by all sincerely Christian churches; and here also is the fallacy of Pusey. He may, with orthodox security, harmonize with Rome, so far as Rome retains infallible truth, but how can he harmonize with her in error? Is not error so completely a part of herself, at the present day, that it could not be separated from

her without destroying her identity as the Roman Church? Is the reunion, in these terms, of truth and of error, compatible? I leave it to Pusey to decide.

All is well so long as Rome confines herself in her catechism to teaching that there are two truths necessary to salvation—viz., the Unity and Trinity of God, and the incarnation, passion, and death of our Saviour Jesus Christ; and it is in these precise terms that I firmly maintain even sincere Roman Catholics will be saved. But when we come to practice, the dogmatism of Rome takes such forms and diverges so far from the infallible authority of the Bible as to render the eternal salvation of the majority of Papists extremely problematic. Is it not natural that a people who trust in the Virgin Mary, in saints, in works of supererogation, in indulgences, in the power of priestly absolution, in Papal infallibility, should lose sight of the only Redeemer and sole Mediator, Jesus? Is not this superabundance of material riches calculated to blind the eye to the only spiritual treasure which alone perishes not, nor suffers to perish—the Divine Jesus?

This proves the fallacy of Pusey. Because the two Churches have some points of resemblance, and because they have some infallible truths in common, although they differ essentially and dogmatically in all the rest, he would pretend that their reunion is easy and natural. I would propose a simile for Pusey's consideration.

Suppose, like me, he was an old bachelor, and, unlike me, desired to exchange his thoughtful solitude

for double blessedness. With a view to finding a companion, he enters a hospital for the diseased, in which women of doubtful reputation pay the penalty of their dissolute conduct. One among the many is a monster in appearance. The fatal poison has corrupted her face, and left unscathed externally only the eyes, internally nothing but the tongue. With those eyes and that tongue she looks at and speaks to our Doctor, and in those eyes and in that tongue the horrible figure exactly resembles himself. Well, I ask Dr. Pusey whether, on the ground of these common points of human resemblance, he would have the courage to unite himself to her in honourable matrimony, to make her the cheering partner of the rest of his life, and hope for a lovely family from her which should grow up and flourish in health and beauty? This is precisely his case when he proposes that the English Church should unite with that of Rome, which is the victim of cankerous disease from head to foot.

Rome is, at the present day, so papistic and so ultramontrane, as to render it difficult to discern her Christian origin, and to me, at least, it is miraculous that any one belonging to her can be a Christian. Pusey ought to know that the Roman Church has been compared to a column of the purest alabaster, in her original faith, as preached by the Apostle Paul to the Roman fathers. But with the lapse of ages, unfortunately came the Popes, and each one of them, in succession, fastened nails and hooks in the column, and one after the other hung rags, and images, and bulls upon the hooks, so that the column has altogether

disappeared, and the eye of the spectator can discover nothing but a trophy of rags and tatters. The column certainly still exists beneath the rags, but no one sees it, and it is only by a great effort of reason that any one can persuade himself of its existence. The rags and rubbish are everything, and the multitude, which judges only by what it sees, takes the rags for the column itself, and adores them in its stead. What, then, does Pusey propose? That the English Church also should recognise these rags and adopt them as articles of faith. No, no, Dr. Pusey; a union of truth cannot thus be attained, but only a union of error. If you can succeed in freeing the column from its rubbish and restoring it to its primitive beauty, you may then talk of reunion; but to propose it while the Church of Rome is buried beneath its errors, proves that you labour under a fallacy. Hence it follows, that though the two Churches have, undeniably, some infallible truths in common, the Church of Rome, on its part, has so many infallible errors, that union between them is morally impossible, their doctrines being incompatible—*ergo*, fallacy.

I shall place the seal upon this paragraph by proving the incompatibility of the two Churches from their different methods of proselytism. Although Pusey recognises no other designation of his Church than "Catholic Church," yet its true designation is "Christian Church." But I will not dispute on this point. Pusey, then, is Catholic, and Newman, too, is Catholic. Now, who has made Pusey a Catholic? The Bible, since the Prayer Book teaches that that alone is to be believed which can be proved from the

Bible. Who has made Newman a Catholic? He himself states, in his answer to the *EIRENICON*, "The Fathers made me a Catholic." Can there be union of end where the means are so antagonistic? Can that be the same Church to which one ascends by the Fathers, and the other by the Bible? No, no, Dr. Pusey, they are two Churches, which *toto cœlo distant*. Imitate, then, your old fellow-labourer and friend, who, in the second infancy of his philosophic mind, tells you with babyish simplicity, "I am not going to kick down the ladder (the Fathers) by which I ascended into the Church." Do not you kick down the Bible, which has made you a Catholic Christian of the English Church, in order to enter the museum of the Vatican, whose authority and whose ideas are incompatible with the orthodoxy of the Reformation, which is the orthodoxy of the Gospel!

III.

THE INADMISSIBLE.

EXAMINATION OF ARTICLES AND DECREES.

"Let us explain" is Pusey's motto. By force of explanations, he hopes to arrive at the *desideratum* of Bossuet thus quoted by Cardinal Wiseman, "that such interpretation may be given of the most difficult (of the Thirty-nine) Articles as will strip them of all contradiction to the decrees of the Tridentine synod" (p. 267). I will, at this point, prove the inadmissi-

bility of this explanation, unless the term *explanation* is to be considered to mean a new and different interpretation given to the Articles, in opposition to their original and proper signification.

The reader will, I trust, bear in mind that my proposition is the inadmissibility of harmony between Articles and decrees ; that it cannot exist, that, in fact, it does not exist, either in general or in details ; and that to say they harmonize, or can be easily made to do so, is superlative fallacy.

Before entering upon this examination, I desire to present to the reader some principles to serve as a guide for arriving at the conclusion of the fallacy of the EIRENICON.

First. That my answer is by no means a defence of the Articles of the English Church, my object being simply to prove their want of agreement with the decrees of the Council of Trent. As I belong neither to the English Church nor to any other Protestant denomination, my sole aim in Italy being the revival of the Church of Rome as it was in the glorious days of the Apostle Paul, so I feel myself called upon only to defend the great principles of Christianity common to all ; and while in this discussion these principles are in no degree compromised by the Thirty-nine Articles, I am not bound to defend them. On the other hand, in all the confessions of the reformed Churches there is what I call human and theological doctrine in open questions and in the mode of explaining dogma ; and it is precisely on such points that I choose to preserve my liberty, since it is precisely on such points that I could not subscribe to certain

scholastic opinions upon some Articles. I am now a Bible Christian, and I shall certainly not submit to any ecclesiastical inquisition on such questionable subjects, not so much because the Bible gives me the right to this Christian liberty, as because I have in my favour, in opposition to those who teach nothing but the authority of the Fathers, the patristic axiom of the great Augustine, "*in dubiis libertas.*"

Second. That the close examination of some only of the Articles will be sufficient to prove their want of agreement with the Tridentine decrees. I can do no more than this, seeing that the minute analysis of all the Articles subject to "explanation" would plunge me into the labyrinth of theology, which I have, from the first, promised the reader to avoid as far as possible; as well as all discussions foreign to my subject, which relates to discrepancy and not to proof. Were I to adopt the contrary course, instead of a small volume, I should produce half a score folios. Besides, it is an old logical axiom, *malum ex quocunque defectu*; so that if I could prove disagreement between the decrees and Articles, even in a single point, that would suffice to demonstrate their inadmissibility.

Third. That the agreement existing between the two Churches in some of their doctrines, as expressed in the decrees and the Articles, is far from proving that the same agreement exists with regard to all their doctrines, or that, because a few can be admitted, therefore all ought to be admitted; so that, in spite of partial agreement, the general agreement of the two Churches remains inadmissible.

Fourth. That the nature of the disagreement is such that every attempt, on the part of the Church of Rome, to give an *authoritative explanation* of the decrees, and, on the part of the English Church, a *right construction* of the Articles, reduces itself to mere pious folly. The disagreement being intrinsic and essential, to pretend to explain it away is a frantic fallacy.

Fifth. That even if the antagonism between decrees and Articles were substantially proved only in a few cases (Du Pin fixes the number at ten, p. 213), or if it were proved but in a single case, these few cases, or this single case, would be sufficient, according to the principle which I have already laid down, to condemn the union of the two Churches as impossible while such antagonism remains.

I now prove the inadmissibility of agreement between the English Articles and the Tridentine decrees.

In order to be more clear and comprehensive, I shall reduce my examination to four points, viz., Rule of Faith, Atonement, Sacraments, Doctrines.

The first five Articles, being purely dogmatic, admit of no discussion on either side. We naturally, therefore, come to the sixth, which is that of the

(a) *Rule of Faith*. I shall cite the passages textually, and then proceed to their examination :

“Article VI. *Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scripture for Salvation*.

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation : so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of

the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

“ Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis,
Exodus,
Leviticus,
Numbers,
Deuteronomy,
Joshua,
Judges,
Ruth,
The First Book of Samuel,
The Second Book of Samuel,
The First Book of Kings,
The Second Book of Kings,
The First Book of Chronicles,
The Second Book of Chronicles,
The First Book of Esdras,
The Second Book of Esdras,
The Book of Esther,
The Book of Job,
The Psalms,
The Proverbs,
Ecclesiastes or Preacher,
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon,
Four Prophets the greater,
Twelve Prophets the less.

“ And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the

Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners ; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine ; such are these following :

The Third Book of Esdras,
 The Fourth Book of Esdras,
 The Book of Tobias,
 The Book of Judith,
 The rest of the Book of Esther,
 The Book of Wisdom,
 Jesus the Son of Sirach,
 Baruch the Prophet,
 The Song of the Three Children,
 The Story of Susanna,
 Of Bel and the Dragon,
 The Prayer of Manasses,
 The First Book of Maccabees,
 The Second Book of Maccabees.

“ All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical.”

Council of Trent, Session IV.—1. *Of the Canonical Scriptures.*

“ The sacred, holy, œcumenical, and general Council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, the three before-mentioned legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein, having constantly in view the removal of error, and the preservation of the purity of the Gospel in the Church, which Gospel, promised before by the prophets in the Sacred Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first published with his own mouth, and then commanded

it to be preached by his apostles to every creature, a the source of all salutary truth and discipline of manners; and perceiving that this truth and discipline are contained both in written books and in unwritten traditions which have come down, having been received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or been transmitted as if by hand, by the same apostles, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit; following the example of the orthodox fathers, doth receive and reverence, with equal piety and veneration, all the books, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, since the same God is the author of both; and also the aforesaid traditions, pertaining both to faith and to manners, forasmuch as they were dictated by the mouth of Christ, or by the Holy Spirit, and have been preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession. Moreover, lest doubt should arise in any one what are the sacred books which are received by the Council, it has judged proper to annex a list of them to the present decree. They are these following: Of the OLD TESTAMENT, the five books of Moses—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy—Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two books of Chronicles, the First and Second of Esdras (the latter is called Nehemiah), Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Psalter of David, of 150 Psalms; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Songs of Songs, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaiah, Jeremiah, with Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel; the twelve minor prophets, namely, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and two books of Maccabees, the

first and second; of the NEW TESTAMENT, the four Gospels, &c.

“And if any one shall not receive as sacred and canonical all these books, with every part of them as they are commonly read in the Catholic Church, and are contained in the Old Vulgate Latin edition, and shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be accursed. Let them all understand by what way and order the said Council shall proceed, after having laid down the foundation of the confession of faith, and of what witnesses and supporters she shall avail in particular to confirm the dogmas and restore the manners in the Church.”

The EIRENICON, p. 213 :

“On the VI. (Article) he (Du Pin) agrees as to the principle that ‘Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation,’ and affirms no more as to traditions than many of our divines have done.” This (viz. that ‘Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation’) we will gladly admit, provided that tradition be not excluded, *which does not exhibit new articles of faith, but confirms and explains those which are contained in Holy Scripture*, and fences them by new safeguards against those who are otherwise minded, and that nothing new is said, but only the old in a new way.

“He thought that the Apocryphal Books would not occasion much difficulty, and allowed them to be called Deutero-canonical.”

As every one may see from the passages quoted, the Articles of the Church of England take only the Bible for their rule of faith; the decree of the Roman Church takes the Bible and tradition equally; and

between Article and decree, Du Pin has the *petitio principii*, Pusey the fallacy. Does Pusey think that because the Article "affirms no more as to tradition than many of our divines have done," the Article itself harmonizes in principle with the Tridentine decree? This is, indeed, a first-rate fallacy. What have your divines to do here with the rule of faith of the Church as established by the Articles? My dear Doctor, with a million of flies you will never make an elephant; and here we are not speaking of individual opinions, but of Church Articles.

Pusey and his party have an ugly trick of perpetually recurring to their well-known sophism, that whatever is not explicitly mentioned and explicitly prohibited in the Articles, cannot be forbidden either to the Church or its individual members. But when a Church forms its dogma into a confession of faith, it is understood that whatever is neither mentioned nor explicitly prohibited is implicitly excluded and prohibited; since, had it been wished to prescribe it, it would have been introduced into the confession. If everything to be excluded and prohibited must be mentioned in detail, a confession of faith would assume the dimensions of a ponderous volume, which would be destructive of its very aim; of being such as to be in the hands of all, to be read frequently by all, and to be retained in the hearts and memories of all. If that which is not mentioned is not prohibited, and if, consequently, tradition, which has no place in the sixth Article, can be admitted by the English Church in her union with Rome, then there is no extravagance which may not be legitimatized by the

Ultramontanists. For instance, as it is not expressed in Article Twenty-three in what manner the priests are to minister in the church, it would not surprise me if the reverend gentleman of All Saints', Margaret-street, in order the more effectually to dramatize his eucharistic symbolism, were to introduce the custom of entering the church in procession every Sunday, and passing through the midst of his elegant congregation seated upon an ass—both himself and his steed caparisoned in cope and stole, embroidered in gold by devout sisters;—his sisters, I mean, not the ass's—who, in the cloister and out of the cloister, lend the aid of their means and their work to the fashionable paganism of a Church, the right designation of which is All Devils' Church.

With regard to Du Pin, who says that tradition both confirms the things contained in the Bible and protects them against those who would deny them, I would simply observe how easily a man who labours under any species of monomania may deceive himself. When articles of faith are explicit and peremptory in the Bible, they have no need to be confirmed either by tradition, or councils, or churches. The Bible itself is an authority which needs the confirmation of no one. That tradition serves to fence the articles of faith of the Bible against infidels and heretics is so puerile an idea, that, in truth, I do not know whether to pity most Du Pin, who originates, or Pusey, who quotes it. Gentlemen, if people do not believe the Bible, it will be very difficult to make them believe tradition; and if rationalists raise objections against the Divine Word, they will certainly

not desist from their opposition, for all the weapons of tradition with which you may attack them. It is but too natural that those who have no respect for the Divine record should esteem human tradition utter nonsense.

With this premised, we come to the detailed examination of the Tridentine decree, with regard to the sixth Article. The sixth Article admits no other rule of faith than the Bible alone, while the Tridentine decree "doth receive and reverence with equal piety and veneration all the books, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, and also the afore-said (unwritten) traditions pertaining both to faith and to manners." Is there agreement between them? It is theologically false to say, as Pusey does, that the sixth Article agrees in principle with the Tridentine decree, since the principle of the Tridentine decree is not purely the Bible, as Pusey thinks, which is the principle of the sixth Article, but consists of equal parts of Bible and tradition. It is a duty to be honest, especially with regard to the discussion of subjects of so much importance, and frankly state the terms of the controversy. When this is done, it is not difficult to arrive at the truth. Now the terms in the present question are the two simple ones: the English Church takes the Bible alone for its rule of faith; the Roman Church takes the Bible and tradition for its rule of faith: *ergo*, they do not harmonize, in the first condition of their reciprocal dogmatism; *ergo*, they cannot unite.

Can the English Church admit tradition in dogma after having declared that "whatsoever is not read

therein (the Bible), is not to be believed as an article of faith?" This would be a contradiction in terms, and, in fact, it would reduce the confession of the Articles to a nullity. It is useless to quote the thirty-fourth Article, "of ecclesiastical traditions." This Article refers not to unwritten traditions in matters of faith, but simply to ecclesiastical traditions in matters of discipline and ceremonial which are susceptible of change, and even of abrogation, according to times and customs. It is with the Tridentine traditions that we have to do here—dogmatic traditions, which have direct relation to the articles of faith. The pertinacity of Du Pin, who insists to admit that tradition which does not exhibit new articles of faith, if it proved anything, would prove to be against the Tridentine tradition. When the Fathers of Trent decreed *de fide* dogmas so contrary to the Bible as justification by faith and works, transubstantiation, purgatory, &c., they relied principally upon tradition; *ergo*, tradition serves to introduce new articles of faith. Pius IX. himself, when he decreed *de fide* the immaculate conception of Mary, being unable to base it upon the Bible, invoked tradition in his favour, and under the ægis of tradition introduced this new article of faith into Roman Catholicism, in total opposition to the entire Bible. *Ergo*, tradition has actually served to exhibit new articles of faith. According to Du Pin, "that tradition is not excluded which does not exhibit new articles of faith." The tradition of the Roman Church exhibits new articles of faith; *ergo*, the tradition of the Roman Church must be excluded from the rule of faith. But the

Tridentine decree necessarily includes and places it on a level with the Bible; *ergo*, this decree cannot be said to harmonize with the sixth Article, which admits only the Bible, and to say that it harmonizes is a fallacy.

What I have here hastily written—for I do not pretend to elaborate a complete tractate against Roman tradition—will suffice to demonstrate that the tradition of the Church of Rome not only cannot be proved from the Bible (in which case it would be authority, not because it is tradition, but because proved by the Bible, or by biblical language), but, further, is contrary to the Bible, and the definition of the immaculate conception of Mary would suffice to corroborate my argument. The pertinacity of Rome in maintaining the divinity of its traditions serves more than anything else to illustrate this subject. Rome knows but too well that she could not for a single moment sustain by the Bible nine-tenths of the doctrines which form her present system; hence she tenaciously holds by tradition, thanks to which she can make her wildest extravagances and most impious absurdities pass for apostolic teaching. The great merit of these traditions is that they are “unwritten;” and that which is not written can always take the form and colour which it is wished to attribute to it. Tradition is always at hand, and always ready to favour any extravagance of the Church and the Popes.

If it is objected that, at the present day, these traditions are “written,” and consequently authoritative and immutable, I am prepared to reply that the Tri-

dentine decree and the practice of the Roman Church speak of "unwritten traditions preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession." Therefore the argument that they are at present consigned to writing is a mere evasion and not a resolution of the difficulty belonging to the controversy. Pray, were not the false Decretals written? Yet who believes them now? Not even Pusey himself, who honestly condemns them to execration (p. 253). The same may be said of the traditions, which, even though they were consigned to writing since the days of Papias, would still remain human notions, uncertain, incoherent, and often false and impious, because in opposition to the written Word of God.

I will not quit this first stage of the disagreement between decree and article without recalling to mind some of the traditions of the Roman Church, and thus giving the reader a brief respite from the seriousness of the controversy, and a few moments' amusement. I shall limit myself to a group of traditions which form a complete whole, and possess unity of subject. It is to be remembered that they are all apostolic traditions of pure coinage, and serve to give an idea of all the other Roman traditions, this being one of the cases of *ab uno omnes*.

Some years ago there was—and if there is not now it is a proof that certain apostolical traditions are considered unsuitable for the nineteenth century—in the Sacristy of the Dominican Fathers at Genoa a relic held in the greatest esteem and veneration—the tail of the ass on which Christ made his triumphal entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. It was but right

that some relic of that glorious event should descend to latest posterity, and the honour of recalling it to the minds of Papists devolved upon the tail of the ass ridden under those circumstances. Apostolical tradition has declared, in continual succession, that it is the tail of an ass, and that the ass whose tail it was, was the ass connected with Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Hence the esteem and veneration for this tail in a Church which instituted a festival and ordered a mass in honour of the ass—mass and festival which I heartily recommend to all Tractarian clergymen as the means of deepening the devotion of their congregations, and at the same time of increasing the decorum of their mystic altars.

The apostolic tradition of the tail introduces us to another apostolic tradition with regard to the ass to which the tail belonged. Tradition relates that the ass belonging to the tail was the veritable and legitimate son of the veritable ass which carried Mary into Egypt when she and Joseph withdrew their child from the persecution of Herod. As a reward for her services to the fugitive family on that occasion, after a life of more than thirty years unchronicled by history, her ruling star conceded to the long-eared mother the privilege of maternity to the son upon which Christ should ride, not as a fugitive from persecution, but as a triumphant hero. Although the mother, at the time of her marvellous confinement, was very old, yet she and her son were both sufficiently hale to be able to make a dignified appearance in the triumphal scene at Jerusalem.

Apostolic tradition further assures us that Mary

and Joseph, during their flight into Egypt, were attacked by brigands, from which it appears that the race is not indigenous to Spain, Italy, Greece, &c., and is not alone contemporary with us. The brigands in question unhesitatingly despoiled the fugitives of all the gold which they had received from the Eastern magi, who went to visit the new-born Messiah at Bethlehem. Apostolic tradition in "continual succession" goes on to assure us that these "wise men of the East" were three in number, and even gives us their names, as Gaspar, Melchior, and Baldassar. It proceeds to tell us that Gaspar was old, and had a white skin and complexion; Melchior was a mulatto, and middle-aged; and Baldassar was perfectly black, young, robust, and athletic. I find some writers slightly vary this account with regard to unimportant particulars, as, for instance, that it was Melchior instead of Baldassar who was the mulatto; but as I can, on no account, admit of the slightest inaccuracy or doubt in connexion with apostolic tradition of this nature, I accept the teaching of the Church of Rome, which, I am quite certain, it received in "continual succession" from pre-apostolic times, and, most likely, from the ass itself which carried Mary into Egypt. It would not be the first time that asses have spoken to such prophets. Those who are incredulous respecting the number and identity of the wise men have only to go to Cologne, enter the cathedral, and give the trifling contribution of two francs to assure themselves with their own eyes and upon the authority of the beadle—who is dependent for his living upon the ass who gave her son to the triumphs of Jerusalem

and her tail to the Dominicans of Genoa—that the sepulchre submitted to their scrutiny contains but three skeletons, that the skulls which they see belonged to the three different races represented by the three magi, and that, therefore, these are undoubtedly their venerated remains. Who can deny it, particularly when we reflect upon the holy relics which it is the privilege of Cologne to possess? A city which preserves the bones of eleven thousand virgin martyrs who accompanied Ursula to her royal marriage as her bridesmaids, with a view of subsequently marrying the royal groomsmen, but who were all murdered in consequence of not choosing to imitate the Sabines—a city, I say, which has foraged up here and there eleven thousand corpses of eleven thousand virgins, which virgins became eleven thousand martyrs, because the eleven thousand gentlemen who would have taken them in legitimate marriage were distasteful to them—a city, I say, which can swallow a pill of such dimensions, and believe a story eleven thousandfold false, can surely, with an easy conscience, admit a tradition merely threefold asinine, the rather that the pre-apostolic pill is presented to its citizens and visitors with the seductive accompaniments of gold, and art, and pomp, which have rendered its cathedral celebrated.

But the epics of tradition which I have undertaken to sing are not yet exhausted. While the adult brigands were relieving Mary and Joseph of their treasures, in order to render them less burdensome to the ass and more cheerful in temper, according to the ancient saying, *cantabat vacuus coram latrone viator*,

and perhaps also because they thought that gold would be altogether useless to them while crossing the desert, a boy belonging to them—a vulgar urchin—amused himself in familiar play with the child Jesus. The little ragamuffin had an apple in his hands; Jesus, it seems, desired to possess himself of it, and brigandine tradition—for the account could originate from no other source—informs us that the rogue, with a certain grace and an ingenuous smile, readily gave it up to the infant. The act was not forgotten, and Jesus, in due time, repaid the courtesy by converting the boy and assigning him a place in paradise after he had become a thief. This occurred about thirty-three years after the plunder in the wilderness and the presentation of the apple, precisely on Golgotha; for apostolic tradition assures us that the thief who was crucified by the side of Jesus, and whom Christ did forgive when dying, was the identical ragamuffin of the wilderness and of the apple, who was then condemned to death on account of having grown up himself a brigand; but Christ, remembering his courtesy and his childish gift, gave him, on Golgotha, as a deserved reward, grace, understanding, and courage to believe and confess him, and to defend him against the attacks of his fellow-thief, thus obtaining from Jesus the promise that he should be that very day with him in heaven. In order that nothing should be withheld from us in this edifying history, tradition has transmitted the name of the fortunate thief, which is Disma.

Such is a specimen of the apostolic traditions which abound in inexhaustible variety in the Roman Church,

and which enter into the principle of its rule of faith. It may be objected that the group of traditions here quoted do not belong to articles of dogma. Be it so; but if the apostolic traditions are all derived from the same source, they must all equally bear the impress of the same truth, whether relating to dogma, to discipline, or to history. When once the falsehood of any is proved, all the rest are proved to be false, or at least not credible. This can never be the case with the *written* Word of God, precisely because it is written, and therefore immutable. And being infallible, because it is the Word of God, it is never found contradictory, and consequently is always credible.

Now, I fearlessly ask Dr. Pusey, do the traditions which I have mentioned exist in the Roman Church or not? If he answers no, then I shall advise him to go to Rome to study Romanism better than he has done from his books or in the company of Newman, who strives to retain in his new faith a portion of the liberty he enjoyed in the English Church. If he answers yes, I would ask him how it can be possible to effect a reunion with a Church which believes in such insane ravings? For my own part, I am willing to hope that so long as a single atom of common sense is left in England, the English will treat such traditions just as they do their Christmas pantomimes, and never change themselves from men to beasts by uniting with a Church which believes in such stupidity, and builds its dogmatism upon it.

It is, then, a fallacy of Dr. Pusey to assert that the sixth Article agrees in principle with the Tridentine decree. Since the Article recognises the Bible alone as

the rule of faith, and the decree, the Bible, and tradition equally, their harmony is about as logical as would be the act of a confectioner who should add a handful of salt to a wedding-cake to make it sweeter and more agreeable to the bride and bridegroom on their wedding-day.

But if, on this side, reunion is impossible in consequence of agreement between Article and decree being impossible, it is not less impossible regarding it on the side of the Bible. Let us for a moment suppose, either that no tradition is proposed in the reunion, or that Rome will renounce tradition for ever. Can the two Churches then agree? Do they actually agree with regard to the Bible? I reply to all fallacies, as well to all Utopians, to all Ultramontanists—No.

The principal differences between them with regard to the Bible, are two: 1st, the text to be consulted; 2nd, its canonicalness. In the English Church, the text is the original of the sacred writings; in the Roman, it is the old Latin Vulgate edition. In the former, the canonical books alone; in the latter, the apocryphal books also are received. Can this be called agreement? And if the disagreement exists, does it not affect the principle of the rule of faith? I maintain and will prove that it does.

Under the name of "Holy Scriptures," in the sixth Article, the English Church can mean nothing but the Holy Scripture *per se*, or the Bible in the original text. To say that in this Article the Church renders its "authorized version" authoritative and obligatory, is to utter an absurdity. When the Article was issued, the authorized version did not exist; if any

versions at all existed in England, they were only the old translation of Bede, and the more recent one of Wyckliff. Certainly the Church never committed to them the care of its dogmatism. With reference to articles of faith, recourse should be had not to any translation of the Bible, but to the original text. Translations have been made and recommended, that the Word of God may be in the hands and adapted to the intelligence of all, in order that people of all languages may be perfect men of God, well instructed in everything necessary to salvation. But in the case of controversy about dogma, the original text must be used, in order to have the sense of Divine inspiration in its full force.

However faithful a translation may be, however classical its language, it can never have the force of the original. Each language has its own special mode of expressing ideas; the phraseology of each is peculiar to itself, and cannot be adapted to another without the loss of much of its original beauty and energy. Indeed, it is not unfrequently the case that a translator is unable to find in his own language expressions corresponding to those of the original, and is therefore compelled to adopt a paraphrase, which is not only productive of weakness, but is apt to change the signification. By way of example: Dante, when translated into English, however accurately, is but the shadow of the Italian Dante, much of the beautiful language and phraseology being of necessity lost. The same may be said of Shakespeare, who, when read in Italian or German, is as much Shakespeare as a cloud illumined by the sun is the

sun to a spectator. Suppose the case of a dispute between English philologists as to the true signification of a phrase or sentence of Shakespeare. In order to settle the dispute, would they have recourse to a Spanish, Italian, German, or other translation? Certainly not. They would consult the first English edition, and, if possible, the original manuscript of the author himself, by the authority of which the dispute would be finally settled.

I say the same of the Bible. In everything relating to contested faith, it is necessary to appeal to the infallible authority of the original text. The authorized translations are excellent for the edification of religious hearts, but are not to be produced as *ultima ratio* against the cavils and subtleties of heresy and rationalism. In the sixth Article of the English confession, under the generic name of the Holy Scriptures, I find the fact of the Bible *per se*, rather than the mode; the Bible *per se* being the text and not the translation, which is nothing else than the vernacular expression peculiar to each people. Thus I conclude, that from the sixth Article we are to understand nothing but the Bible as it is in the text, for various reasons, called original.

The Roman Church, on the other hand, by "Bible" means nothing else than that "contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition." And here is the mischief. Let the reader well observe the Tridentine expression, "the old edition," and he will shortly see the consequences. For the better understanding of the subject here treated upon, I may say that by "Latin Vulgate" is meant the Latin translation of the

Bible which existed, under the name of *Italica*, long before Jerome, to whom it was erroneously attributed. The *Bibbia Vulgaris* was so called because it was translated into Latin, which was then the *lingua vulgaris*, or the vernacular language, of the people under the Roman Empire. It is nothing else than a translation, nor could the holy intentions of Jerome, who collated it, render it perfectly correct and faithful, even in its first appearance, as may be gathered by the reproaches addressed by Augustine, among others, to Jerome himself upon the subject.

Now, it is to this translation that the Church of Rome desires recourse should be had as the rule of faith; and it is to this translation alone, irrespective of the original text, that she wishes respect and attention to be paid. One proof of this, among thousands, is given by Cardinal Ximenes. When this learned prelate prepared the first Polyglot Bible, he chose the Latin Vulgate for the middle column of his edition, and the two original texts for the side columns. For this he gave the following reason in his editorial preface. He placed the Latin Vulgate between the two texts, he said, in the same manner as Christ was crucified between the two thieves; thus giving it to be understood that he and his Church looked upon the translation as Christ, and the original texts as the two thieves. Can the English Church, according to its sixth Article, countenance such blasphemy?

But let us proceed with our examination, and take into consideration the specific expression of "old edition," to which I have alluded. The two words,

“old edition,” form an abyss which divides the two Churches, and renders their reunion impossible. The “old edition” means the edition which existed previously to and at the time of the council—the edition which served the Tridentine Fathers as the rule of faith and as the basis of the dogmatism of the Roman Church. What sort of edition was it, then, to be held in such honour, and professing such authority? We learn this from subsequent facts.

Sixtus V. discovered that the old edition was interlarded with errors, of which he undertook the correction. The work was carried on under his immediate superintendence in the Vatican palace, and he himself corrected the printer's proofs. Upon the conclusion of the printing, he published it as his own edition—hence called the Sistine—and in the Bull with which he gave it to the Catholic world he declared infallibly that he had found and corrected five thousand errors in the old edition used by the Tridentine Fathers; but that since he had corrected them, no one in future was to search for any further errors. Clement VIII., however, his successor, paid so little respect to the infallibility of Pope Sixtus V., his predecessor, as to revise and correct the Sistine edition on his own account. In the infallible preface of his new edition—called from him Clementine—he, too, infallibly declares that he has found and corrected another two thousand errors in the Sistine edition, which, in its present emended state, is to be received by the Roman Church as a perfect edition. In spite of this, De Rossi, librarian of Parma, and, above all, Father Luigi Ungarelli, professor of

theology at Rome, discovered not a few errors even in the Clementine edition. Father Ungarelli, the rival of Champollion and Rosellini in the profundity of his acquaintance with Oriental languages, and as the elegant illustrator of the Egyptian monuments in Rome, printed a book in Rome itself upon these errors, courteously denominated variations. His book bore the *imprimatur* of the Holy Inquisition, and was entitled *Prolegomena in Sacræ Scripturæ Libris*. In it he proves that the Latin Vulgate, adopted by the Roman Church, still contains seven hundred and fifty deviations from the original text. "The old Latin Vulgate edition," then, of which the Tridentine Fathers made use as the rule of faith and basis of dogmatism, contained no fewer than seven thousand seven hundred and fifty deviations from the original text of the Bible! What faith can be accorded to a translation which varies so much from the original? Who would give the name of Bible to such a translation?

Let not the reader imagine that these deviations are of slight importance, and have no influence upon the essence of dogma. From those which still remain we may judge of those which have been corrected since the council, and we see that they are deviations of the greatest importance. Take, for example, the *ipsa conteret*, "she shall crush thy head," instead of "he shall crush thy head" (Genesis iii.); "the sacrament" instead of "mystery," speaking of the marriage of Christ with his Church (Ephesians); "pilgrims" instead of "strangers," in order to authorize the vagabondage of the former; "do penance" instead of

“repent,” thus substituting bodily penance for change of heart, &c., and the reader will readily arrive at the conclusion that such a translation in no way presents the Word of God in its original purity and faithfulness, and the more that the alterations, far from being accidental and *bonâ fide*, are intentional and deliberate, as declared by Cardinal Bellarmine in his letter to Luca Burgensis, and by the infallible Pope Clement VIII. himself in the prefatorial Bull to his own edition.

If such, then, is the case, how can Dr. Pusey in logic and in conscience assert that the two Churches harmonize in Bible principles? And if the one with the original text, and the other with the Latin Vulgate, are at the antipodes from each other, how can Dr. Pusey reunite them in one single rule of faith? Do I exaggerate, then, when I accuse the EIRENICON and its author of fallacy?

We now come to the canonicalness of the Bible; and on this point also we shall find harmony between Article and decree inadmissible, and the reunion, consequently, inadmissible. It is impossible that the two Churches can be more clear, explicit, and decided than with regard to the canonicalness of the Bible. The English Church dogmatically rejects the Apocrypha; the Roman Church dogmatically receives the Apocrypha. In such terms, so divergent, can there be a point of agreement?

The triple reasoning of Pusey on this subject (p. 214) reduces itself completely to a triple sophism.

Du Pin, he assures us, “thought that the apocryphal books would not occasion much difficulty,

and allowed them to be called *Deutero-canonical*." I would beg Dr. Pusey to observe, that though Du Pin pleased to call them Deutero-canonical, in order thus to facilitate the reconciliation of the two Churches, such denomination was nothing else than a scholastic artifice unworthy of a gentleman and a Christian. Pusey ought to know that this denomination in no degree changes the nature of the thing; for whether canonical or Deutero-canonical, they would still be held to be inspired books. The argument is simple enough. In the canon of the Bible nothing but the inspired books can be admitted, but to the canon of the Bible the Tridentine Council adds the apocryphal books; then in the Church of Rome the apocryphal books are inspired books.

To what, then, does the proposal of Du Pin, to call them Deutero-canonical, amount? To an artifice or to irony. Deutero-canonical signifies nothing, but, subsequently added to the canon; if added, they now are included into the biblical canon; and if included, they form an integral part of the Bible in the Roman Church.

It is certainly curious to find so learned a professor as Dr. Pusey labouring under the persuasion that this denomination of Deutero-canonical was nothing but a concession, on Du Pin's part, to facilitate the reunion of the screech-owl and her admirers. He ought to know better than any one that they were called Deutero-canonical by the Council of Trent itself. The council could not deny that in previous times they had been rejected from the canon by the unanimous consent of the Church; so that when the Tridentine Fathers desired to insert them in the canon,

and impart to them all the authority of canonical books, they could give them no other title than Deutero-canonical. It was entirely due to the appellation that the books began to enjoy the veneration and authority of inspired books.

Now, if the Tridentine Fathers, in opposition to all the apostolic tradition—so much respected and venerated by them—admitted the apocryphal books into the biblical canon, Du Pin and Pusey display rare courage in asserting that the apocryphal books would not occasion much difficulty in the reunion. They must indeed be at the A. B. C. of Romanism. In the first place, I would observe that if the Roman Church, in spite of all the apostolic traditions, and, indeed, in spite of the Bible itself, forced the apocryphal books into the canon, that alone would suffice to prove that she must have a special object for doing so, and that object could be no other than the authorization of her own dogma in opposition to the dogma of the Word of God. Why otherwise decree them as canonical? Is not the Word of God sufficient for salvation? Is not the Scripture, which is inspired, sufficient to render the man of God perfect? What purpose, then, is served by the addition of the Apocrypha?

I shall not waste time here in discussing why the apocryphal books are not the inspired Word of God? It is sufficient for me that they were not held to be inspired by the Jews, the only legitimate guardians of the Word, so far as the books of the Old Testament are concerned; that they were not held to be so by the apostolic, post-apostolic, or patristic

writers, nor by the primitive Church. Therefore the apocryphal books are not the divine and authoritative Word of God ; that is, they are not the Bible.

With what object, then, were they made to form part of the Bible in the Roman Church, by means of the Tridentine Council? In order to place the strangest doctrines and the dogma most antagonistic to the true Word of God under the ægis of their protection. This I will prove by a few facts. Dr. Pusey, who foretels the universal incredulity of the world when Mariolatry shall have reached its apogee according to Faber's prophecy (p. 216), ought to know that the development of Mariolatry arose from the moment when Albertus Magnus perverted the whole book of *Wisdom* by applying it exclusively to Mary. Taking for Mary only all that applies to the wisdom of God, the Roman Church began to rave about Mary being co-eternal with God ; that she was his companion in the creation of the world ; that God founded the Church upon her seven principal virtues, and similar blasphemy. Such is the purpose which the Apocrypha serves in the Roman Church. Purgatory in itself, prayers and oblations for the dead, supposed to be in purgatory, and, above all, the merchandize of the mass, and of indulgences to liberate souls from purgatory, find no other biblical authority than the apocryphal books of the Maccabees. So much for dogma. With regard to morality, the infamous doctrine of the Jesuits, that the end sanctifies the means, is authorized by the indecent conduct of Judith in the apocryphal book of that name. The iniquitous doctrine of Liguori respecting equivocation and men-

tal reservation, is authorized by the characters which figure in the romance of Tobit, which is another of the apocryphal books. And so on with numerous other aberrations of the Roman Church authorized by the apocryphal writings, to which I can give neither time nor space here. This is why the council admitted them into the biblical canon under the appellation Deutero-canonical. And our Utopians think that they shall encounter little difficulty on the part of the Roman Church in this respect, or that she, in order to facilitate the reunion, will renounce the Apocrypha, and thus cease to be the Roman Church. Can men, venerable for age and study, possibly conceive such hopes? Have I not a right to call it a pious sophism on their part? Well, not a sophism, but, better still, a fallacy.

We will now pass to Dr. Pusey's second sophism, "Our Homilies inculcate a secondary inspiration of some, at least, of the Apocrypha, since they speak of its words as said by the Holy Ghost and as Scripture." In speaking of the Homilies, I can only repeat what I have said above in reference to the argument of the divines, adopted by Pusey himself with regard to tradition. When a confession of faith is discussed, the discussion should be limited exclusively to it, in order that it may be *in merito*. I may esteem and value the opinion of homilies, of bishops, of theologians; but they cannot alter the terms of the confession. Here we have the sixth Article explicit in the rejection of the Apocrypha from the dogma of the English Church. All the theologians, and all the bishops, and all the homilies in England, then, are

unable to give to the said Apocrypha the least dogmatic authority.

With regard to secondary inspiration, if we deprive it for a moment of its benign nature as a sophism, as I have called it, it will become not only a *reductio ad absurdum*, but an absolute absurdity, and may be considered a perilous doctrine and an impious insinuation. Let us proceed in order.

Even admitting the scholastic distinction of primary and secondary inspiration, the apocryphal books must ever be in themselves excluded from the canon of the Bible, in which no books can enter but those of primary inspiration. Hence it is folly for Dr. Pusey to fancy that it will be easy to come to an understanding with Rome upon this subject, and accept the Apocrypha, in the reunion, with the stipulation for secondary inspiration. Rome knows too well that *secondary inspiration* would, *ipso facto*, destroy the Deutero-canonicalness of the books in question, decreed by her at the Council of Trent. The distinction, then, is altogether illusory in principle, and therefore useless—either primary inspiration or uncanonicalness.

With regard to secondary inspiration—which is a term absolutely unknown to the prophets of God—I would just ask the learned professor of Oxford in what it consists, and what are its functions and object? To say that in the Apocrypha there are words “as said by the Holy Ghost,” is to say too much. Even in the Life of Renan, or in the books of Colenso, there are words which are to be found in the Bible, and with which, consequently, holy men

were inspired by the Holy Spirit. And yet no one would be so silly or so wicked as to maintain that these two writers were under the divine influence of a secondary inspiration. But some may reply, there are holy subjects in the apocryphal books, even according to the tenor of the sixth Article, adapted to give rules of conduct and examples of life, and to these a secondary inspiration may conscientiously be assigned. Such may be the case; but this sort of inspiration may be claimed by all writers who write about the things of God for the edification of souls and for the Church. Yet it is an inspiration which can in no degree or manner approach that of the canonical books of the Bible, which are directly inspired by God to reveal his will to man.

By this kind of artful distinction, any conclusion, no matter how false, may be reached. As an example in point, the "Experiences" of Miss Goodman show that a certain section of Puseyism holds the anonymous book of *Rudolph the Voyageur* as little less than canonical, and assign to it a special inspiration. This *Rudolph* is nothing else than a most stupid and impious rhapsody of sectarian impertinence and rancid asceticism, calculated to make one look upon the secondary inspiration of Puseyism as nothing better than a dirty puddle filled with croaking frogs, and in which pigs voluptuously wallowed.

It is my firm conviction that the less that is said about the apocryphal books the better. Though it is true that they contain doctrines and examples of holy life, yet *sunt mala mista bonis*, and there is so

much in them that is improper and immoral, that it is undesirable to encourage their perusal, since the evil they present is likely to make more impression upon the reader than the good which they contain. When we have the inexhaustible fount of the Bible, *cui bono* this tea-spoonful of Apocrypha in which drops of murderous poison are mixed?

The secondary inspiration of the Apocrypha, then, can serve no purpose, since it would not render them less canonical with the Roman Church, or more canonical with the English Church. The facility, then, of a reunion on this point is a mere sophism, and therefore a fallacy.

Pusey's last sophism, which may be looked upon as the corollary of the two preceding, is contained in this sentence: "On the other hand, the Roman Church could hardly condemn the statement of St. Jerome, which our Article quotes, received, as it was, by unquestioned authorities, down to the Council of Trent." True, the Roman Church does not condemn that "statement;" but it pays as much heed to it as I do to the ritualism of the Puseyites, which they seek to found upon the authority of the middle ages. But what then? Does not Pusey see that he destroys his thesis by this argument? If the statement of Jerome existed in the Church before the Council of Trent; if it reached the Council of Trent corroborated by unquestionable authority; and if, in spite of this, the Council of Trent decreed the canonicalness of the apocryphal books, in opposition to that statement, of what value can the statement be in the eyes of the Roman Church when cited by the sixth

Article? Of no value whatever. Those who did not respect it before the Council, will certainly not respect it after. If the apocryphal books were declared canonical in opposition to that statement, they will not certainly again become apocryphal because the sixth Article cites the authority of St. Jerome upon the subject.

Besides, Pusey knows that this statement was not made by Jerome alone, but that it is met, more or less explicitly laid down against the apocryphal books, by Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory the Great, and Eusebius, as well as by various councils, beginning with that of Chalcedony. And yet the Tridentine Council did not hesitate to declare them canonical.

This shows the sophism of Pusey. He hopes that the Roman Church will not condemn the statement of Jerome when the Roman Church has already condemned it by declaring the Apocryphal Books canonical.

I thus naturally arrive at my conclusion.

Pusey admits the reunion of the two Churches to be easy of attainment, seeing the facility of harmonizing Articles and decrees. But the two Churches do not harmonize in the rule of faith of their confessions; *ergo*, the reunion is inadmissible.

The two Churches, in the rule of faith, do not harmonize. The sixth Article of the English Church admits only the canonical Bible; while, on the other hand, the Tridentine decree of the Roman Church admits Bible, Apocrypha, and tradition. No explanation, either on the one side or the other, can change

the nature and the terms of these two divergent confessions.

So long as the two confessions necessarily differ, they necessarily do not harmonize, and necessarily cannot harmonize.

This is precisely the case with the sixth Article and the Tridentine decree (Sess. 4, 1), on which account their harmony is inadmissible. Owing, therefore, to the disagreement in the rule of faith, the reunion of the two Churches is necessarily impossible, and its simple proposal is a fallacy.

Ergo, the EIRENICON which proposes it is a fallacy.

(b.) Let us now see whether there is agreement between Articles and decrees in the *Atonement*, as Pusey writes; and if I can here prove their discrepancy, let us hear no more of reunion.

The examination does not touch upon the history of original sin, which was called by Augustine *felix culpa quæ nobis tale promeruit salvatorem* — a most unfortunate expression of mere ascetic sentimentalism, which, in a certain sense, overlooks the gravity of man's offence which demanded so sublime a reparation. Nor does the examination touch upon the mode of the reparation or the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, which made our peace with God, since the two Churches, with a slight divergence on these two points, will be found to harmonize.

I consider the atonement, then, in its effects, as implying the justification of man and his final salvation.

Now, do the two Churches agree in the doctrine of justification? Pusey says yes; I maintain no. Let us see.

The Doctor writes (p. 19): "I believe that we have the same doctrine of grace and justification. There is not one statement in the elaborate chapters on Justification in the Council of Trent which any of us could fail of receiving, nor is there one of their anathemas on the subject which in the least rejects any statement of the Church of England;" and he is so persuaded in his opinion, that in the note at the foot of the page he adds: "I endeavoured to point out many years ago, that if the people on different sides dwelt on their real agreement instead of their differences, in wording their belief as to justification, this would be the result." Pusey's reasoning of this kind always partakes of the nature of sophism. The belief that two Churches hold the same doctrine of justification must be arrived at, not by the process of comparing the points of agreement, but the points of difference. While differences exist, who but Pusey can say, "We have the same doctrine?" The ancient syrens had the faces, necks, bosoms, and busts of beautiful women, but as they had, in addition, the tails of fishes, no one could speak of them as of the Venus of Phidias, which, instead of a tail, had legs of most exquisite beauty. And so it is, my dear Doctor, in our case. Seeing that there are differences between Articles and decrees, the first obligation of the honest controversialist is to observe them, the second to see if they can or ought to be made to disappear;

and if this should prove inadmissible, his last obligation is to declare impossible the reunion of the two Churches between which such differences exist.

That the differences exist we know, not only because Pusey himself asserts it, but because it is explicitly and absolutely proved by the confessions of the two Churches, which, in this respect, are as wide asunder as the poles.

Article 11. "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely expressed in the Homily of Justification."

Article 13. "Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin."

Council of Trent, Session 6, Canon 3. "If any one shall say that without the prevenient inspiration of the Holy Spirit—without his aid—man can believe, hope, love, and repent, as is necessary, in order that the grace of justification be conferred upon him, let him be accursed."

Canon 4. "If any one shall say that the free choice of man, moved and excited by God, contributes

nothing in agreement with God, who excites and calls him, towards disposing and preparing him to receive the grace of justification, let him be accursed."

Canon 9. "If any one shall say that the wicked is justified by faith alone, so as to imply that nothing more is required than co-operation to obtain the grace of justification, and that on man's part it is not necessary that he prepare and dispose himself by the movement of his own will, let him be accursed."

Canon 7. "If any one shall say that all the works done before justification, from whatever motive, are true sins and deserve the wrath of God, let him be accursed."

Canon 10. "If any one shall say that by the justice (righteousness) of Christ men are formally just (righteous), let him be accursed."

Canon 11. "If any one shall say that men are justified either by the righteousness of Christ alone, or by the remission of sins alone, independently of grace and charity, or that the grace by which we are saved is simply a favour of God, let him be accursed."

Canon 30. "If any one shall say that, after having received the grace of justification, the penitent sinner's transgression is remitted, and that the sinner is freed from eternal punishment, and that no guilt or temporal punishment remains to be atoned for, either in this life or the future, in purgatory, before he can enter the heavenly kingdom, let him be accursed."

From these quotations, the reader can see for himself how and to what extent the two Churches harmonize in the doctrine of justification. It seems truly

incredible that Dr. Pusey should see no difference, when the difference is so vast and palpable. Does he wish us to believe in his insincerity? I will not do him such an injury. But let Pusey be fully persuaded that differences exist. On the one side, we have the Church of England, which admits of faith alone for the justification of man before God, and which with regard to justification declares that man is "accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" and on the other side we have the Roman Church, which only allows justification when man is disposed and prepared for it, and attains to it, not by faith alone, but by the aid of hope, charity, penitence, and other things; which declares the justified sinner not formally just in the justice of Christ; which decrees that the imputation of the righteousness of Christ is not sufficient to justify man, and that, after the reception of justification, he has to suffer the penalty of sin, justification itself being insufficient to cancel it; and after all this to say, "I believe that we have the same doctrine of grace and of justification," is to demonstrate how far the fallacy of a writer, who labours under the monomania of reunion, may be carried.

Admitting the impious doctrine of the Roman Church of the 10th and 30th Canons, what is made of the righteousness and atonement of the divine Jesus but irony and insult? With such a doctrine, a thousand texts of the sacred Scripture are reduced to silence, or, indeed, to falsehood. That the sinner, though blacker than the raven's wing, becomes, *ipso facto*, whiter than the wing of the dove; that the

believer in Christ passes in an instant from death to life; the remission of the imprisonment of the debtor with the remission of his debt; the all-sufficiency of Christ, and a thousand other infallible assurances, all disappear to give place to a conditional, incomplete justification, and leave to purgatory to perfect that which the blood of Christ on the cross was incapable of performing. And is it with such a Church that you would make terms of reunion, without the removal of these sacrilegious differences? Sophistry, fallacy, impiety!

Ah! blessed for ever be Jesus, who gives us his faith to believe in him, and when we believe in him, imputes to us his righteousness, by which alone we are saved! Blessed be Jesus and his Word, so different from that of Churches and theologians, which would sterilize our faith and poison the confidence we have in his sacrifice, infinitely meritorious for us!

I will here introduce another point of real difference between the two Churches with regard to the subject of the atonement, and it is the doctrine of merit.

Article 14. "Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety; for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say we are unprofitable servants."

Canon 32. "If any one shall say that the good

works of a justified man are in such a sense the gifts of God, that they are not also the good merits of the justified himself; or that the justified himself does not, by the good works which are done by him through the grace of God and the merits of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member, truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life provided he be in grace, and even an increase of glory, let him be accursed."

In this manner do the two Churches harmonize: the English excludes all merit from the works of the justified sinner; the Roman attributes a real merit to them. The first does not admit of works of supererogation; the second commands and extols them. Fine harmony, indeed!

As usual, Dr. Pusey, to prove the easiness of agreement between Articles and decrees, adduces the cavil of Du Pin as an authority, and confirms it on his own part by a sophism. I give them both in their precious originality (p. 215):

"On the fourteenth Article, Du Pin explained away the offensive sense of the term 'works of supererogation,' was willing to drop the term, and only wished the distinction to be maintained between works of strict precept and those which were of counsel only. This distinction our people must, of course, admit; since our Lord says of celibacy, All cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is *given*. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." In this passage, as every one sees, Du Pin has the upper hand. By a distinction which distinguishes nothing, he seeks to entrap the admirers and fanatics of the reunion into

a subtle cavil, which says no more than precisely what the Tridentine had previously decreed.

In fact, the serious reader will understand that the works of strict precept of the Papist writer are those which Article 14 solely prescribes to be observed in accordance with the words of Christ—"when ye have done all that are commanded;" and that the works of counsel only of the French caviller are those which Article 14 resolutely prescribes as besides over and above God's commandments. The works of strict precept, then, are commanded by God, and the works of simple counsel are works of supererogation. If Dr. Pusey wishes to reverse the proposition, I leave him at perfect liberty to do so. In order the better to assure himself of the validity of my reasoning, he may say that works of command are those of strict precept, and that works of supererogation are those of simple counsel. To give to works of supererogation the name of works of counsel for courtesy's sake and to facilitate the reunion, is a mere play of words, which is, in itself, unworthy of a writer who has any self-respect, and becomes altogether dishonest when used to deceive the simple, who are unable to measure the extent of the cavil and the sophism. This is a case which justifies the quotation of the well-known adage, for Pusey's benefit, *nisi nomine mutato*; or, the one still better known, *mutato nomine de te fabula narratur*. Our unionists change the name of works of supererogation, but the works of supererogation remain in fact.

Pusey is so confident in this fallacy of his, that he does not hesitate to declare solemnly, "this dis-

inction our people must, of course, admit." If by "our people" you mean the people of the *Church Times*, of the *Union Review*, the people of Tractarianism, of Ritualism, and of Ultramontaniam, then your "it must, of course, admit," may pass, and indeed may be quite correct. But if by "our people" you mean true Churchmen, or the Christian people of England, you must suffer yourself to be told that such a people will not become fools in obedience to the mania of any one; not even of yourself. A people must, indeed, have become insane, who, in order to solve a difficult question, accepts a distinction which leaves the question substantially the same. So long as there remains in the Church of England a single individual unaffected by your Utopian views, the fourteenth Article will be read as condemnatory of every work of supererogation or of counsel, for the simple reason that such works are not commanded; and that, therefore, to teach them is complete arrogance and impiety. Any one who has not yet reached the point of sacrilegious impiety of reducing the Word of God to a mere nullity, knows the unprofitableness of these supererogatory works, and confines himself to what is dictated by his divine Redeemer, "If ye will enter into life, keep the commandments." That Pusey chooses to corroborate his sophism by calling in question the salvation of any individual who has not obeyed "a call from God," or not done those works of supererogation which have been especially pointed out to him, is a matter that I leave entirely in his hands. As he pretends to know more than Jesus Christ himself, so he can legislate for his people, even

in opposition to Article 14, and that without incurring the charge of arrogance and impiety. It is useless to quote the words of Jesus, as upon celibacy, to prove the admissibility of works of counsel or supererogation. Shall I be called arrogant if I frankly tell Dr. Pusey that he does not understand the passage he has quoted? Does Christ there speak of celibacy in the sense of Rome and Oxford? Does he speak of celibacy at all? Does he recommend it to the Church and clergy as a work of the highest perfection? Pusey sees all this in the text. Posterity will surely envy us the privilege of living contemporary with a man who could create ecclesiastical celibacy out of nothing: *et sunt eunuchi qui seipsos castraverunt propter regnum cœlorum.*

I would further observe, in passing, how wisely the Reformers declared, in the above Article, that such things could not be taught without arrogance and impiety. To take up only this subject of celibacy, it will be seen that of a so-called counsel the Roman Church has made more than a precept, having rendered it obligatory upon the clergy and the monastic orders by means of an oath and solemn vow. This proves two things: first, that the counsel is received as more perfect than the command of God; second, that counsel, in the course of time, takes the place of command, and brings the latter into discredit. This alone should be sufficient to condemn all the works of supererogation *en masse*, by whatever means they may be presented to the faithful. In an age rife with rationalism, according to what Pusey himself asserts, it is a diabolical mission to contend for the stupid fable

of supererogation. The duty of every heart which loves Christ in sincerity is to strive that all his commandments be observed, for in such observance alone is salvation to be found.

There is no harmony, then, between Articles and decrees in reference to the doctrine of the atonement. Reunion being, therefore, impossible, the EIRENICON is simply a fallacy.

(c.) *Sacramentalism* forms the third thesis of discrepancy between English Articles and Tridentine decrees. I shall prove their inadmissibility in two aspects, and hence the double fallacy of the EIRENICON—the number of Sacraments, and their nature.

Let us begin with the number, and cite the texts.

Article 25. "There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

"Those five commonly called sacraments — that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

Council of Trent, Session VII., Canon 1. "If any one shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or fewer than seven, namely, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme

unction, orders, and matrimony, or that any of these seven is not truly and properly sacrament, let him be accursed."

From these quotations, the difference of the two confessions is strikingly shown. The English Church admits two sacraments only; the Roman Church admits seven sacraments. It appears to me that the difference is essential, unless seven and two are the same in Pusey's arithmetic. There is no room for cavil. While the decree fixes them at seven, neither more nor less, all equally instituted by Christ, all equally true and proper sacraments, the Twenty-fifth Article bestows the name of so-called sacraments upon all but Baptism and the Lord's Supper, declares the other five not to have been instituted by Jesus Christ, but grown partly of "the corrupt following of the Apostles," and that they are partly states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not the like nature as sacraments. The five, then, are not true and proper sacraments in the English Church, but these five are true and proper sacraments in the Roman Church; then the two Churches differ essentially in the number of the sacraments, and so long as they do not harmonize in this point their union is inadmissible.

It is just here that, in their desire to see them harmonize, the Utopians enter the field of reunion with every sort of fallacy. Pusey, as usual, on this point, too, takes the precedence by right, and mounts, eagle-like, above all smaller fowl in cavils and sophisms.

To demonstrate the facility of the agreement on the part of the Roman Church, he quotes his *Du Pin*

(p. 217), who, with his usual condescension, demands nothing more than the acknowledgment "of the five sacraments, whether instituted immediately by Christ or no." I would ask Pusey, as I have hitherto omitted to do, who engaged Du Pin to be the mediator between the two Churches? Did Du Pin speak on his own account alone, or on that of his Church? If Du Pin was, in his times, no more than Pusey is in ours—that is, a well-wisher—his word is of no authority, and there can be no guarantee as to the limits of the concessions which the Roman Church would be willing to make to effect the reunion. Let Pusey remember that he himself has laid down the principle "authoritatively explained," and that "authoritatively" does not mean explanations given by individuals, but given by the Church and by those empowered by her. Thus the explanations of Du Pin are of no authority, and hence, even if they were sincere, they could not serve as the basis or means of reconciliation.

But they are not sincere. When the Roman Church, in the Tridentine Council, declares accursed those who deny that the seven sacraments were all instituted by Christ immediately, how can one of her members assert that it is indifferent to the said Church whether they were instituted immediately by Christ or not? Can Du Pin be sincere, then, in his accommodation? Certainly not. And even supposing, by way of hypothesis, that he was sincere, is that a proof that he expresses the opinions of his Church in his sincerity? Certainly not. It is worth repeating this—the Church which declares the seven sacraments

to be instituted by Christ immediately, and that in œcumenic council, can never consent to assert that five of them may not have been instituted immediately by Christ. Such admission would destroy the infallibility of the council, and, with it, the infallibility of all its dogma.

Pusey thinks it possible to accept the terms proposed by Du Pin, since "the controversy turns not on the word, but on the meaning of the word" (p. 218). But this is not the argument of a serious man, such as, on such a subject, the writer of an EIRENICON should be. It is precisely in the meaning of the word that the whole question consists. The Roman Church does not attach any importance to the word sacrament, but to its signification. If instead of sacraments they were called even kicks or blows, provided they did but signify the same as sacraments, to her it would be the same thing. Now, if the whole question depends upon the meaning, Dr. Pusey is mistaken when he thinks that Du Pin insisted upon the acknowledgment of the five sacraments in order that the number of seven should be complete in name, but not in fact. *Risum teneatis*, take the throne and the kingdom, but leave us the name of king, and that suffices for us. I therefore say, that supposing Du Pin sincere, even admitting five of the sacraments not to have been instituted by Christ immediately, yet they ought to be taken as "true and proper sacraments in the meaning of the word," such being the decision of the Tridentine decrees in the definition of the said seven sacraments in particular. If Dr. Pusey believes otherwise, he labours under a

fallacy, in which case Du Pin, with the sincerity of mental reservation, has deceived the acute Oxford professor so as to make him take black for white, or the word sacrament for its signification.

It is not wonderful that Dr. Pusey should have fallen into the scholastic trap laid for him, and that, by way of revenge, he should quote the authority of Cardinal Bessarion, with regard to the two sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ himself against the five superfluous sacraments of Du Pin (p. 218). I ask Dr. Pusey's pardon, however, if I frankly tell him that his Cardinal Bessarion is of no authority whatever in the present controversy. First, because Cardinal Bessarion is nothing more than a private individual, and not the Church; and, according to Pusey's own premiss, there can be no explanation unless it comes authoritatively from the Church; *ergo*, the explanation of Bessarion has no authority to decide the controversy. Second, the opinion of the said Cardinal being pre-Tridentine, can in no way alter the terms of the Council of Trent, as might have been supposed to be the case if the said Cardinal had been a post-Tridentine writer. Was there any need to quote Bessarion to prove a fact known even to *lipis et tonsoribus*? The whole primitive Church, all patristic tradition, and venerable antiquity, recognised but two sacraments instituted by Christ. It was only in the corruption, and ignorance, and superstition of the middle ages that "the corrupt following of the Apostles" began to be called sacraments. In those ages of ecclesiastical barbarism, which Puseyism seeks to revive in England at the

present day, the number of so-called sacraments was not at all determined; some admitted four, some five, some eight, and so on. In the midst of this sacramental chaos arose the voice of PETER LOMBARD, who, on being called from Italy to teach theology in Paris, was the first to fix the number at seven. Although his theory was embraced and maintained by the Roman Church, yet, until the Council of Trent, it was not dogmatically defined; on which account Cardinal Bessarion, who wrote A.D. 1436, could lawfully and effectively promulgate his distinction between major and minor sacraments, as stated by Pusey.

The distinction, however, sunk to zero after the Council. The Tridentine Fathers having decreed that all the seven sacraments are equal in institution, nature, and grace—that there is no greater and less belonging to them, but that they are all equally “true and proper sacraments,”—it is easy to see that the distinction of Bessarion counts for nothing now.

It is not the distinction of the Cardinal, which defines the question at the present day, but the decree of the Council. This, in spite of the Cardinal's distinction, sanctioned the number of sacraments as seven. To seek to prove, then, that the number of sacraments instituted by Christ immediately was two, upon the authority of the pre-Tridentine Bessarion, is to prove nothing at all. What would be said of an English farmer who, upon digging up the fossil remains of a mastodon in one of his fields, should come to the conclusion that, because its bones were found on English soil, the

animal must certainly have lived in England, and that if it once lived here it is a sign that it is still living somewhere in England? Does it need all the celebrity of Owen to prove to the rustic the futility of his reasoning? I say the same of Pusey and his party when they quote authority and facts anterior to the Council of Trent in favour of their scheme. Authority and facts were, *de jure et de facto*, abrogated by the Fathers sitting in that Council, and by their definitions and decrees.

But what cannot the force of education and prejudice do? The Council of Trent having decreed the number of sacraments as seven, little matter that the Article of the English Church fixes them exclusively as two, and condemns the others as "the corrupt following of the Apostles," or at best considers them simply as "states of life allowed in the Scriptures." Our Ultramontanists, headed by Pusey, will have the number seven, although, from a certain modesty, very becoming in their maiden sect, they admit the distinction of major and minor sacraments—two of the first and five of the second. "Bessarion gives as the definition of other sacraments of the Church, that 'they have something which is seen—something which is comprehended, not by the bodily eyes, but by the mind alone,' viz., the invisible grace, which all believe to be given in confirmation, orders, absolution, and in marriage also, hallowing its act. A distinction allowed in Bessarion might well be allowed to us" (p. 218).

As every one may see, all this is sophistry. If the definition of Bessarion were worth anything at all,

the number of sacraments, instead of being limited to seven, might be extended to a hundred at least. Why, then, only seven? How is it that Dr. Pusey finds the terms of the definition only in confirmation, orders, absolution, marriage, and anointing of the sick? With that definition in my hand, it seems to me those would be more reasonable who, instead of accepting the five supererogatory sacraments, should wish the washing of the feet to be considered one, because it was instituted by Christ himself, because it was commanded by him, and because it had the signification of grace. But because the Tridentine Council excludes it from the number of the seven, Dr. Pusey never dreams of naming it. This proves that he wishes to take the Council and not the Bible as the point of departure to establish the dogma of the reunion.

I should see much more of the nature of a sacrament in prayer than in any of the five supererogatory ones; and that because we have the promise of Christ himself, that whatever we ask in his name shall be given us. On the other hand, what invisible grace have you from the so-called sacraments of matrimony and anointing? And what else are confirmation and orders but "the corrupt following of the Apostles?" I shall treat elsewhere of absolution, in order to prove that it is not a sacrament, even according to the definition of Bessarion.

Let me, then, ask, for the last time, what is the object of this mania of proving that the English Church in its reunion with Rome may be permitted to hold these five sacraments as secondary, or of less

importance? The answer is always the same. The mania of aping Rome and of proving that by such explanations the Articles and decrees of the two Churches may be made to harmonize. But the harmony would be only apparent and under mental restriction; therefore there would be no agreement at all, therefore it is a fallacy.

In order the more effectually to destroy this fabric of cavil, I shall gladly avail myself of the same argument as Pusey—"A distinction allowed in Bessarion might well be allowed to us also." But this distinction between two sacraments instituted by Christ himself and five others of less value, was by no manner of means granted to Bessarion by the Council of Trent, which, on the contrary, fixed them at seven, all "true and proper sacraments;" *ergo*, what was not granted to Bessarion will not be conceded at the present day to Dr. Pusey and his Church. *Ergo*, the reunion, on this pretext, is a true fallacy.

The English Church having declared in its Articles that it recognises two sacraments only, I should, therefore, appear to deny its authority, or at least to treat it as a doubtful one, if I stayed but a moment to confute the sophisms of Pusey in defence of the five sacraments, which in the above Articles are stigmatized as the "corrupt following of the Apostles," or recognised merely as "states of life allowed in the Scriptures." The sophistry of the EIRENICON is patent. Its object is to harmonize the inadmissible; but to confute it in detail would be a sinful waste of time. It does not devolve upon me to prove that there may

be "agreement" on this point between the two Churches, when I deny the existence of the thing in which he would make the "agreement" consist.

Let us speak clearly. The English Church has two sacraments only; the Roman Church has seven; then the English Church is five short, to find itself in agreement with the Roman. Pusey would wish the five missing ones to be accepted with a distinction. But the distinction being a mere sophism, the whole argument resolves itself into a fallacy. If it can be proved that there are some sacraments instituted by Christ, and others that are not—some sacraments of the first order, and others of the second order; some true and proper sacraments, and others which are only tolerated; some sacraments greater and some less—in that case, Pusey's distinction may have some signification and some weight in the argument. But so long as the Roman Church decrees that its seven sacraments are divinely such, and the English Church admits only two of them as divine, the five rejected will never be sacraments, in spite of all the efforts of Bessarion, and Du Pin, and Pusey, to make them go down our throats as so.

Let Pusey be content to keep to the letter as well as to the spirit of the Articles, without intruding his scholastic restrictions (p. 20). It seems to me that I have greatly the advantage over him in precision, when I discover the "corrupt following of the Apostles" in confirmation, and in extreme unction; in orders and marriage, two "holy states of life allowed in the Scriptures;" and in absolution, neither the one

nor the other, but simply a clerical impertinence founded upon an erroneous interpretation of the Gospel.

Here I dismiss the subject of the five so-called sacraments to enter upon the demonstration of the inadmissibility of the Tridentine decrees, in consequence of the disagreement existing between them and the English Articles with reference to the two real sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

In the sacrament of baptism we have a double difference between the two Churches ; in baptism in itself and in its effects. I begin with baptism in its effects with regard to original sin and its consequences.

Article 9. "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam . . and this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated ; whereby the lust of the flesh . . . is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin."

Council of Trent, Sess. V. 5. "If any one denies that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, or even asserts that the whole of that, which has the true and proper nature of sin, is not taken away, but says that it is only shorn or not imputed,

let him be accursed. . . . The sacred synod, however, admit that in those baptized, still the concupiscence remains. The concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls 'sin,' the sacred synod declares that the Catholic Church never understood to be called sin, as though it were in the regenerate *truly and properly* sin, but because it is from sin. If any one shall retain the contrary, let him be accursed."

Hence arises the different position of the two Churches. In the English Church, in accordance with the Bible, with reason, and experience, the infection of nature, vitiated by original sin, remains even after baptism; and although there is no condemnation for him who believes and is baptized, yet the inheritance of infection, which is the direct consequence of original sin, remains the same, and can only be counterbalanced and overcome by a succession of Divine grace, thanks to which the regenerate man is supernaturally enabled to persevere to the end. On the other hand, original sin is not only remitted in the Roman Church, but the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is removed; so that, according to the terms of this definition, the infection of human nature is done away with, which is directly contrary to the Article, and is proved false by the Bible, by reason, and by experience. That in baptism, in a certain way—though we must never confound the offices of faith and those of water in regeneration—the old man ~~is~~ put off and the new man, created according to God, is put on, is very well; but that the infection of nature remains, even in the new man, is

confirmed by the Bible, by reason, and experience; so that the Roman Church, by proving too much, proves nothing when it asserts that those who are baptized are made innocent, spotless, pure, harmless, and pleasing to God. If they are innocent, they certainly can no longer be subject to the infection of nature—infection which Adam did not possess when innocent, and which, consequently, cannot be in him who is made innocent by baptism; and when innocence is imparted to the regenerate in baptism, this signifies no less than that they no longer have that source of infection within which stimulates to sin. To call them *innocui*, while labouring under the load of infection, would be worse than mockery; it would be an insult. The two Churches, then, do not harmonize on this subject.

Pusey, however, seeks to make them harmonize, and does his best to prove (p. 18) that the concupiscence which, in the Article, "hath of itself the nature of sin," harmonizes with the concupiscence which, in the decree, has not the nature of sin, but only comes from sin, and inclines to the same. Subterfuge and not argument! If you yourself admit, Doctor, that the Roman denial—that is, not *properly sin*—implies that it hath something of the nature of sin about it, your own *something* proves that the Tridentine decree differs from the English Article, which speaks not of a *something*, but of "nature of sin."

The ambiguous language of the Council of Trent will not have escaped the reader—language to which I have elsewhere made allusion (chap. 2, § 1), and through which the Tridentine Fathers deny the infec-

tion under anathema, and in the same paragraph admit it, in a certain manner, although with mental reservation, and this, too, under anathema. In this way do they revive the game of the Pagan priesthood, *ibis redibis non morieris in bello*, and say, with Manning, that there is no longer the nature of sin, and with Pusey, that there is something, at least, of the nature of sin. Is it possible to argue with such a council?

With regard to baptism in itself and its mode of administration, the question becomes still more serious, and the differences between the two Churches still more striking, although this is not the place for entering upon it fully, as I am not writing a tract upon the Sacraments; yet I shall say sufficient about it to prove the inadmissibility of the Tridentine decrees. Pusey has a special way of reasoning of his own. If this be admitted, it is impossible to refuse assent to his erroneous consequences with regard to baptism. I find at page 20 that he thus theorizes upon the subject: "We have pointed out again and again how the Church of England, while teaching (as the Fathers often do) that Baptism and the Holy Eucharist have a special dignity, symbolized by the water and the blood which flowed from our Redeemer's side, is careful not to exclude other appointments of God from being in some way sacraments." I shall not argue as to whether this is really the teaching of the Church of England: it is sufficient for my argument that it is not the teaching of its Articles, and I shall confine myself to making an observation upon the supposed teaching of the Fathers. Even if it

were true that the Fathers had often thus taught, this would but confirm the old axiom, that as there is no error unsupported by the authority of some philosopher, so there is no heresy which cannot be maintained by the authority of some Father. For my part, however, for the honour of Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, at least, I absolutely deny the assertion of Pusey. In all these Fathers I have found the reverse of what he asserts. In speaking of the Eucharist, they recognise in the bread and wine symbols which allegorize the body and blood of Christ, and not the reverse. In fact, unless men are, in future, to walk on their heads and reason with their feet, it must be allowed that the water and wine of the two sacraments symbolize the water and the blood shed by Christ at his death on Golgotha, and not the contrary. To support the reverse is the same as saying that the thing symbolized becomes the symbol of itself, which is too absurd to be treated seriously. Who would dare to assert that Christ symbolizes the cross, when it is the cross which materially symbolizes Christ hung upon it? I beg of Dr. Pusey, then, to be more precise in his terms. Sentiment is not controversy, nor the solution of controversy. The utmost that I can allow him is the ascetic tropology of those who fancy the water of baptism to be allegorical of that which issued from the side of Christ after his death; the sacrament of baptism being administered to those who are dead to grace and who revive in regeneration, as signified by this sacrament.

Passing now to baptism in itself, we find that the

difference between Articles and decrees is greater than ever, and consequently the reunion between the Churches more and more inadmissible. I will first quote the texts, and then freely give my opinion upon them, in order the better to prove the discrepancy existing between them.

Article 27. *Of Baptism.*

"Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed, faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

"The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

Council of Trent, Sess. V. *Decree of Original Sin.*

2. "If any assert . . . that Adam having soiled himself with the sin of disobedience, has transmitted to all the human race only the death of the body and not sin, which is the death of the soul, let him be accursed."

3. "If any assert that this sin of Adam, which is sin transmitted to all by origin and by propagation and not by imitation, and which is inherent in every man as his own sin, may be removed . . . otherwise than by the merit of the one Mediator Jesus Christ our Lord . . . or deny the application of this same

merit of Jesus Christ in the sacrament of baptism, rightly administered according to the form of the Church, whether to adults or infants, let him be accursed."

4. "If any one shall deny that new-born children should be baptized, or say that they contract no original sin from Adam, so as to make it necessary to expiate it by the washing of regeneration, that they may attain to life eternal, let him be accursed."

5. "If any one denies that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ which is conferred in baptism, let him be accursed."

Section VII. *Of the Sacraments in general.*

6. "If any one shall say that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, and do not confer the said grace upon those who oppose no obstacle to it, and that they are only as external signs of grace and righteousness received by faith, and as an indication of a Christian profession, by means of which we may distinguish between the faithful and the unfaithful among men, let him be accursed."

8. "If any one shall say that the grace of the sacraments of the new law is not conferred *ex opere operato*, but that faith alone in the Divine promises is sufficient to ensure grace, let him be accursed."

From a simple comparison of these passages, the immense distance which separates the English Articles from the Tridentine decrees will be seen. They no more resemble each other than white resembles black. Let us see.

I would first of all observe the moderation of the

twenty-seventh Article, which assigns to baptism no more than belongs to it. It appears to me that, in many Churches, an importance is given to baptism which it has not received from Christ. Pusey, with too much care, quotes the English Catechism (p. 21), in reference to the two sacraments generally "necessary to salvation"—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. But if by "necessary to salvation" absolute necessity be understood, I do not hesitate for a single moment to declare the proposition false in a Scripture sense. I can admit only a conditional or relative necessity, or, according to the schools, a *necessitas secundum quid*. To me—and I glory in the belief—the only thing absolutely necessary to salvation, the true *conditio sine qua non*, is faith in Christ, which necessarily, in the justified, must be operative faith, or living in charity. The sacraments follow as auxiliaries of salvation, necessary in their turn, but of subordinate necessity; not at all as conferring grace before justification, but only as signifying it, and visibly sealing it and augmenting it, by means of faith in the justified. I certainly admit that those who neglect the sacraments ordained by Christ for the purpose of keeping alive and increasing the faith of the justified, run a great risk of growing spiritually cold, and thus endangering their eternal salvation. Worse still would it be to despise them. I know not how to reconcile deliberate disobedience with professed faith in Christ, and should, therefore, stand in great doubt of the eternal salvation of any such.

But, laying aside this extreme hypothesis, let us look at the sacraments in their beneficent and provi-

dential nature, without attributing to them an adventitious necessity, which is not to be discovered in their institution. Of what use are the sacraments to those who have not faith? Of no use—no use whatever. On the other hand, how many cases are met with in human life, of true believers who, from one cause or another, cannot receive these two sacraments, and who are saved notwithstanding! The thief crucified beside Christ on Calvary had never received either of the sacraments, although they were already instituted; and yet he was with Christ in Paradise that very day, for his heroic confession of faith in Christ, made to Christ himself. These two sacraments, then, should be retained by the Church and by the faithful, with the object for which they were given—which is a most holy object—without attributing to them, like the Roman Church, the importance of being necessary—of absolute necessity—to the eternal salvation of souls. I feel no hesitation in declaring that this guarded sobriety is to be found in the twenty-seventh Article of the English Church, which is thus removed thousands of miles away from the Tridentine decrees.

This subject naturally leads to another point of discrepancy between the two Churches—regeneration. Great confusion exists in the various theological schools with regard to the precise terms of regeneration. If the Bible alone be taken as the guide in such disquisitions, it is certain that nothing is meant by regeneration but the restoration to original righteousness, which, lost by man through the disobedience of Adam, he finds once more in the original

righteousness of Christ imputed to him. But when is it imputed to man? The Bible answers in a thousand places, when the man who is dead in Adam believes in Christ, he revives in and by Christ. Regeneration, then, is by faith, and not by water. Faith produces the new birth of the soul; water is but the sign of this. This is denied by the Council of Trent and affirmed by the English Article. There is, therefore, complete disagreement between them.

The Roman Church, with its *ex opere operato*, declares that the regeneration of the soul follows instantaneously, absolutely, and necessarily upon the administration of material baptism, provided it be administered with the forms prescribed by the Church, and the ministrant perform it with the intention of baptizing. Hence the *opus operantis Dei* remains absolutely excluded. Neither internal grace, nor inclination of the heart, nor faith in the participant, is mentioned as necessary; all is replaced by the material sacrament. That must be called an impious doctrine which substitutes the work of the Church for the work of God; or, rather, the mechanical and paid work of man for the gracious and gratuitous work of the Redeemer.

The Church of England, with orthodox precision, declares that baptism is not only a sign of profession, but also a sign of regeneration, or new birth. Baptism, then, in the English Church, is not regeneration of itself, but only the sign of that regeneration which enters the heart through faith alone. If, as the Tractarians blasphemously maintain,—especially since

the famous Gorham case,—baptism regenerates by itself, if it is by means of material water that the renewal, or new birth, of the soul takes place; in that case I shall make use of the words of Dr. Pusey himself against this ultramontanist insanity, “which overthroweth the nature of a sacrament in that the sign and the thing signified become the same” (p. 24). But if it is absurd to suppose that the figure or the sign is the same as the thing signified, in that case baptism cannot be regeneration, but only a sign of regeneration.

The Article of the English Church proceeds throughout in the same accurate and coherent manner. It is right that after baptism “rightly received” the baptized should be grafted into the Church. It is right that the promises of the pardon of sin and the adoption to sonship with God should be visibly signed and sealed by baptism. It is right that faith should be confirmed and grace increased, because all this is but the *opus operantis Dei*; or, in other words, that faith existed, the promises existed, and adoption existed before baptism, which did nothing towards all this gracious work of the *operantis Dei* but imprint its visible seal and introduce the spirit of growth. All this is eminently orthodox.

When Dr. Pusey has proved that the *opus operantis Dei* of the English Church is perfectly similar to the *opus operatum* of the Roman Church, then he may speak of agreement between Articles and decrees; but so long as the two systems of baptism are as different as heaven from earth, the English Church cannot change the grace of its sacrament for the

material rite of Papacy; and hence follows the impossibility of the reunion of the two Churches.

With regard to the baptism of children, as with everything else connected with the sacrament, the two Churches are in direct opposition. In the English Article, it is simply "wise to be retained in the Church;" which is equivalent to being highly commendable, but not to being dogmatically commanded. And this is as it ought to be. The only conclusion to which a reasonable man can come upon this much-disputed question is that there is nothing contrary to the baptism of children in the Word of God; and that the baptism of infants, as an open question, or one not infallibly defined in the Bible, may be retained in the Church, "as most agreeable with the institutions of Christ."

The Article reserves this subject for its last paragraph, and that not as a corollary, but rather as an appendix, or, better, as an exception. This proves to me, beyond all doubt, that the preceding part has reference solely to the baptism of adults, which is "the true and proper sacrament." I do not wish to lay down a theory; to do so here would be quite beside the argument. I shall, nevertheless, express what I think upon the subject, which is, that there can be no "true and proper sacrament" in the Church of the *opus operantis Dei*, unless those who receive it are capable of knowing what they receive, and with what object they receive it. If the Lord's Supper is to commemorate His death, can a child who knows nothing about His death commemorate it? Certainly not. For him, then, the Lord's

Supper is not "a true and proper sacrament." The same may be said of Baptism. The administration of it to children may have and has an external significance which renders it desirable in the eyes of the Church; but to speak of it in connexion with internal renovation is to stultify the whole Bible.

On this account, I greatly admire the biblical orthodoxy of the Reformers, who recognise in this Article the benefits of baptism for adults, with whom alone it is "a true and proper sacrament." With them it is a sign of regeneration; and why? Because regeneration by faith pre-exists. How is any one "grafted into the Church as by an instrument?" Because by the new birth he is already grafted into Christ. Why does he receive the visible sign of the forgiveness of sin? Because he has already obtained forgiveness through repentance of heart. Why is the promise visibly sealed of our adoption to be the sons of God? Because adoption takes place when we believe to salvation. Why is faith confirmed and grace increased? Because they previously existed in the justified. In this manner is baptism, with adults, "a true and proper sacrament"—a sacrament of Christ, and not of the Church—a sacrament of the *operantis* and not of the *operato*.

In the Roman Church, the baptism of infants is not a counsel nor a permission, but a command; or, to express it according to the true phrase, a *conditio sine quâ non* of eternal salvation. This is only natural and consistent with its system of perversion. Having declared the *opus operatum* a dogma, it is sufficient for her that the sacrament is

administered in her prescribed form. The simple material administration] suffices to regenerate, *ipso facto*, any one to whom it is administered; therefore children, though incapable of intelligence and faith, are made sons of God and heirs of heaven. In order that nothing may be wanting in the sacramental farce, the Roman Church directs that the priest who administers baptism shall pronounce over the child, *alphata quod est adaperire*, to imply that by this conjuration the intelligence of the child is opened to know Christ, although he certainly cannot know Him while he is in his swaddling bands, and may, perhaps, grow up an infidel. In the same manner, the Roman Church teaches that by baptism it infuses the habit of faith into the child, which some take for the gift of belief, others only for the exercise of that gift; but, in some way or other, an infusion of faith—an infusion, however, which does little honour to the sacrament, since, notwithstanding the administration of baptism to its children, nine-tenths of adult Catholics believe in nothing at all.

Is not this a difference between the two Churches? The divergence reaches its height when we consider baptism in connexion with original sin. In the English Church original sin is nothing, as I have already shown, but “the fault and corruption of the nature of every man . . . whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness.” In the Roman Church, the original sin of Adam is sin inherent in each son of Adam as his own sin (*inest unicuique proprium*); and, therefore, in consequence of this sin, imputed to

each; all the descendants of Adam are subject, from their birth, to the damnation of hell: hence the necessity, in the Roman Church, for the baptism of children. If baptism does not relieve them from the sin of Adam, although they have themselves committed no sin, yet, because of Adam's sin, they must be lost. An impious doctrine this, which, at the same time that it destroys the chief benefit of the redemption common to all—that is, the restoration of men before God, thanks to the washing of the blood of Christ, owing to which there can be no condemnation of children who die without baptism, because they are already baptized in the blood of the atonement—also destroys every idea of the goodness, the providence, and, above all, the justice of God. Can the God who condemns innocent souls to hell for sin which they have not committed, be the God of the Bible, the God of Christians? A thousand times no! He may be the God of the Papists, as he was formerly the God of the Pagans; but he has nothing to do with our God, who is just, and loveth justice.

It may be objected, that we have no right to form an idea of the justice of God from the conception which we have of justice in ourselves. The objection is as stupid as the doctrine is impious which attributes such hateful injustice to God. Man is made in the image and likeness of God, therefore we can form no other conception of the attributes of God than from that which we possess in ourselves as the copy of the divine original. What tells us of the love of God but our love? What can persuade us of

the goodness of God but our own goodness? And so we can form no idea of the justice of God but by the conception that we have of justice in ourselves. These are laws made by God himself, and foolish is he who breaks or opposes them!

Now, as there is neither code of laws nor legislator among us who can justly condemn the innocent for the guilty, so we may say without hesitation, that to condemn the descendants of Adam to eternal torment for the sin of which he was guilty and they are innocent, would be the gravest injustice. That "sin entered the world by one man" is true; but the declaration that all sinned in Adam, does not refer to actual sin which we have not committed, but only to damages: we have all lost our original rights, and inherited the baneful effects of that sin, though it was not our own.

Nor in this loss and inheritance is there any injustice on God's part. Original righteousness and all the gifts and advantages inherent to it were given by God to Adam to be transmitted to his descendants, but upon condition of his obedience. He failed to fulfil the condition, and God was not unjust in depriving him, consequently, of his rights, and allowing the effects of his sin to descend upon his posterity. Sin, *in itself*, cannot be imputed; and if it is not imputed, children who die without baptism will certainly not, in consequence, endure eternal punishment. I shall not discredit the whole Bible to accept the impious doctrine of the Tridentine Council. The Bible asserts that when the Son of Man shall come

in the glory of his Father, with his holy angels, then shall he give to every man according to his works.* The Bible tells me, too, by Paul, that every man shall bear his own burden; that every one shall answer for his own actions at God's tribunal; *ergo*, no one will be condemned for the actions of another; *ergo*, the sin of Adam cannot be imputed to his descendants; *ergo*, no one will be condemned for a sin that is not his own; *ergo*, the baptism of infants to cleanse them from original sin is a Tridentine impiety.

That which we virtually lost and unfortunately inherited in Adam must be repaired, not by baptism, but by faith in Christ, the Redeemer. Thus by faith, in place of the original justice we have lost, the original righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. The infection of human nature is corrected and counterbalanced by the grace of the divine Redeemer in the justified man who lives by faith. Baptism is nothing more than the sign, seal, and confirmation of this. Here lies the essential difference between the two Churches with regard to baptism, and here is shown the inadmissibility of the Tridentine decrees, and the impossibility of the reunion.

Nor is the impossibility removed because there are some in the English Church who rave after the Tridentine aberrations void of truth. What has to do with the twenty-seventh Article if some are delirious after a baptismal regeneration, if others talk blasphemy upon the damnation of unbaptized children! *Stultorum infinitus est numerus* was a saying of antiquity. And it is not to be wondered

* Matt. xvi. 27

that fools are to be found in the English Church, in spite of the orthodox wisdom of her Articles. All such are drowning in the dead sea of Papist corruption, having abandoned the bark of the confession of faith of their own Church, as found in the Thirty-nine Articles. In order to disguise the fact that they are drowning, they grasp at every stick and straw that floats upon those waters. Under the pretence of having homilies, rubrics, and catechism in their favour, they seek to keep afloat as Churchmen, while, in truth, they are sinking as Papists.

I will add but one more observation. On the subject of baptism it is necessary to be very precise and perfectly scriptural. If once the Church begins to talk about the *opus operatum*, her spirituality and the power of Christ must depart from her. If a priest can make a son of God with a few drops of water, even of a new-born child, the same priest may summon Christ—body, blood, soul, and divinity—to the altar at his pleasure; and the same priest has full power to absolve the soul from all sin committed after baptism, and thus to take the place of God himself. Those who admit the cause cannot refuse to admit the effects. If the sacrament of baptism is carried beyond the limits of the English Article, to place it within that of the Tridentine decrees, the impiety of the Roman Church and the charlatanism of its clergy will be legalized.

Let us now undertake the examination of the Lord's Supper—also called the Eucharist—in order that every honest Englishman may perceive the palpable difference which exists between the two

Churches in everything relating to this sacrament, and hence the inadmissibleness of their reunion.

The subject is so vast, and at the same time so intricate, that, for its better development and comprehension, I shall dispose of it under five heads: Transubstantiation, Presence, Sacrifice, Communion, Adoration.

A. Transubstantiation.

Article 28. "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

Council of Trent, Sess. 13, Canon 1. "If any one shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but shall say that he is in it only as in a sign, or figure, or by virtue, let him be accursed."

Canon 2. "If any one shall say that in the most sacred sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, there remaining only the species of bread and wine, which

conversion, indeed, the Catholic Church most aptly called transubstantiation, let him be accursed."

Can the difference be plainer? The dogmatic question reduces itself to two clear and absolute terms: the English Church rejects transubstantiation; the Roman Church decrees transubstantiation. In these two terms there can be no reunion.

But here enters the scholastic question, and by means of distinctions, reservations, cavils, sophisms, and even absurdities, the ERRENICONISTS force themselves to give a plausible appearance even to impossibility—a species of gaily-painted mask, which makes a skull pass for the head of a living man.

Before saying a few words upon the anti-rational, maniacal doctrine of transubstantiation, I wish here to note two or three contradictions into which the learned professor of Oxford has allowed himself to fall, and which seem to me to prove, that when a person educated in the truth desires to maintain error, in consequence either of not yet being quite familiar with the latter, or not having fully laid aside the former, confusion is naturally generated in his mind, and his tongue and his pen slip into contradictions.

"My own conviction is, that our Articles deny transubstantiation in one sense, and that the Roman Church, according to the explanation of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, affirms it in another" (p. 229). Here we have transubstantiation in three senses. And three they must be. Since the English Church denies transubstantiation in the sense of Rome, it is a sign

that it has a sense of its own; and if the Roman Church, in its Catechism, affirms transubstantiation in a sense different from the Council and from the English Church, it is a sign that it has a special sense of its own. Here, then, are three senses of transubstantiation. May not this be called a scholastic labyrinth, more intricate than that of Crete? Who will give us a Dædalus to enable us to emerge from such theological charlatanism without loss of common sense? Fortunately, the English Church makes use of no mental reservation in its Article, as Pusey seems to opine, he having studied it in the school of Du Pin and the Jesuits, and learned it from some of his old companions, more especially Manning. It, therefore, does not only deny transubstantiation in one sense, but *in toto*. It has no transubstantiation, and does not desire to have it.

“On the 28th (Article) Du Pin was willing to omit the word ‘transubstantiation,’ and to substitute ‘changed.’ But the question remained the same, whether the change intended was physical or hyperphysical” (p. 228). “A sacramental or hyperphysical change no English Churchman who believes the real presence, as his Church teaches, could hesitate to accept” (p. 25). Now, if the question between the English and the Roman Church is the doctrine of transubstantiation; if the doctrine of transubstantiation is entirely restricted to the signification of the word itself; if by the substitution of the word “change,” the question of transubstantiation remains the same; if the change intended, whether physical or hyperphysical, does not alter the sense of the Tridentine

transubstantiation, how is it that no English Churchman could hesitate to accept a hyperphysical change? And how is it that the hyperphysical change would not be transubstantiation. "Since Du Pin, as well as others, owned our Communion Service to be orthodox, I should hope that the belief of the 'real objective presence' as therein contained . . . might become the basis of mutual understanding, instead of any inquiries into the meaning of the words substance or change. Plainly, since the meaning of the word 'substance' has been changed, since the word 'transubstantiation' was adopted in the Latin Church to express the change produced by the consecration in the Holy Eucharist, it is not too much to ask the Roman Church to explain what that substance is which they believe to be changed" (p. 229). Plainly, this is puerile contradiction. If you say that you can understand without investigation the meaning of the word substance or change, how is it that in the same breath you say it is not too much to ask the Roman Church to explain the meaning of its substance, in order to show in what the change of transubstantiation consists? How is it that while you hope that you have so much in your Communion Service to serve as the basis of a mutual understanding, you thus ignore the terms and the meaning of the Roman Church in the doctrine of transubstantiation as to be obliged to exclaim, "it is but reasonable that they should explain the meaning of *that* which they require us to express our belief in" (p. 229)? You do not know, then, Dr. Pusey, the "meaning" of Tridentine transubstantiation. In that case, you cannot sincerely

assert that your Communion Service might become the basis of mutual understanding. Understanding of what, if you do not know what it is about? You think it reasonable to ask the Roman Church to explain the meaning of its "substance" changed in transubstantiation, which proves that, at present, you do not know. Very well; but in that case, you cannot honestly assert that it is not necessary to make "inquiries into the meaning of the words substance or 'change.'" Excuse me, my dear Doctor, but these are contradictions which, while they are unworthy of you and your talents, prove that when once any one enters upon the path of fallacy, he speedily loses sight of the path of reason and logic in the mazes of cavil and contradiction.

With regard to transubstantiation in itself, independently of the quibbling and sophistry of the EIRENICON, it is nothing else than the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such is the irrational and insane doctrine in all its naked simplicity; a doctrine which the English Church scripturally rejects, and which the Roman Church Tridentinely defines *de fide*. Pusey (p. 24), in order to make Article and decree harmonize, would change the terms of the question and transfer it from the council to the schools. But I take no notice of such subterfuges, and am not to be moved from the council. Now, the Tridentine Council speaks absolutely of the change of substance; the Article rejects such change, and that is sufficient to show that they neither do nor can harmonize.

Truly, the marvellous ingenuousness of Pusey would do honour to a charity boy when he declares: "I know not what can be included in our term 'substance,' which the English Church affirms to remain, which is not also included in the Roman term 'accidents,' which they also affirm to remain" (p. 24). It is easy, however, to make him know. The English Church means by "substance," that which essentially constitutes bread and wine; the Roman Church means by "accidents," that which relates to the appearance of bread and wine. The same difference, then, exists between the two terms as between a body and its shadow. Well, then, I would ask Pusey if, given the case of a sunshiny day at Oxford, he was passing from his rooms to the lecture-hall, and paused for a moment to contemplate the unbesmoke-clouded planet as it illumined him from head to foot, and threw his prominent and distant shadow into the court of Christ Church, where his students were assembled, would they avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by the shadow to learn from it a lesson in Hebrew? I think not; and I think also that Dr. Pusey would not change himself for his own shadow, although it might *retain the natural qualities* of all his physical dimensions. The case of transubstantiation is substantially the same.

Pusey believes that the Catechism of the Council of Trent, by leaving its natural quality of nutriment to the bread, leaves the substance of the elements intact; and that, therefore, the Roman Church on this point agrees with the English Church, which has no change of substance in the sacrament. Pusey,

however, labours only on supposition, and reasons only upon a misunderstanding. The Catechism cannot annul the Council; and its object is not to create new doctrines, but only to explain those of the Tridentine. *Ergo*, if the Council of Trent destroys the substance of the bread and wine by transubstantiation and changes it into the substance of Christ, the Catechism cannot assert that the said substance of bread and wine remains the same after transubstantiation. Where would transubstantiation be in that case? Transubstantiation would thus be reduced to a word without any sense. But the best is that the Catechism does not assert what Pusey opines. It is true that the bread still retains the quality natural to bread of supporting and nourishing, but in spite of this the substance is changed. "That cannot be," adds Pusey, "because the schoolmen thought that with the 'change of substance' that power of nourishing ceased" (p. 24). But if this was logic in the absurdity of schoolmen, it could not be dogma in the Tridentine absurdity. I call the absurdity of the schoolmen logic, because if, notwithstanding transubstantiation, the bread—and the same may be said of the wine—continues to retain all the qualities of the substance of bread, to call it unsubstantial is absurd; but when it is called unsubstantial, it is logic that it should no longer nourish.

But the subject changes its aspect in the Tridentine dogma. The bread may nourish as bread, the wine may intoxicate as wine; but, in spite of that, they are no longer substance of bread and wine, but only appearance. The real substance, after transubstantiation, is the body and blood of Christ; the bread

and the wine are nothing but accidents or appearance. But how can accident or unsubstantiality nourish and intoxicate? This is the absurdity of the Tridentine doctrine; but, nevertheless, it is a dogmatic doctrine.

The doctrine, then, of the Church of Rome, with regard to transubstantiation, is that the words of consecration are succeeded by "that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood, there remaining only the species of bread and wine." Is this language clear or no? Can the Roman Catechism change it by its explanation? It does not change it. Under the name of species or accidents, the Roman Church signifies all the material qualities inherent to the substance of bread and wine—taste, smell, colour, weight, dimension, and nutriment. Some may say, nutriment can never be considered as an accident, but is a substance in itself. Be it so; but weight is also a quality, indivisible from substance; or rather it is a substance by itself, and yet it disappears as a substance in transubstantiation, and only remains in the bread and wine as an accident. But that is absurd, and cannot be. I do not deny the absurdity, but with the Roman Church it must be. What is not absurd throughout this iniquitous absurdity of transubstantiation?

Then, with all the nutritive qualities which remain in the bread after the "change," the bread is no longer bread but only accident, or the appearance of bread; *ergo*, it is no longer the substance of bread. But if it is no longer the substance of bread, Dr. Pusey labours under a fallacy when he seeks to make

it understood that the "accidents" of Tridentine transubstantiation harmonize with the "substance" of the English Article. The Article excludes all change of substance; the decree changes the substance and leaves only the accidents; *ergo*, the two Churches on the doctrine of transubstantiation, as well as in everything else, are at the antipodes.

If the sacraments are a sign of something signified, though the sign cannot become the thing signified, it must yet retain its nature unchanged, otherwise it would cease to be a sign; therefore water remains water, bread bread, wine wine, and thus all room for sophism and fallacy is excluded.

With regard further to the "two natures in the sacrament," thanks to which there is the substance of the bread and the real substance of Christ, the discovery of Theodoret, developed by Pope Gelasius, and which sends Pusey into ecstasies of delight, I am grieved to say this is only an additional invention to gull the simple. If there are two natures, does any one think they can be united in one sacrament, like the divine and the human in the person of Christ? But what are these two natures? Materiality and immateriality at the same time, and here is the absurdity; a duplicate of substances which would reduce the Eucharist to a sacrament of indigestion. Dr. Pusey, if you ever believed that, with this discovery "the whole controversy between us is at an end" (p. 230). As the two natures subsist through mere fallacy, so the harmony to be attained, by its means, between Article and decree, is also fallacious; and the reunion between the two Churches is also fallacious.

As the consequence of the group of absurdities found in the doctrine of transubstantiation, and as a more striking demonstration of the great discrepancy between Articles and decrees, we will now take under examination the question of the

B. Presence, or that which is found in the Sacrament.

Article 28. "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death, insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ. . . .

"The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

Council of Trent, Sess. 13, Canon 4. "If any one shall say that, when consecration is performed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is not in the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but only in the use, whilst it is taken, but not before or after; and that in the consecrated hosts or particles which are reserved or remain after communion there does not remain the true body of the Lord, let him be accursed."

Canon 8. "If any one shall say that Christ exhibited in the Eucharist is eaten only spiritually, and not sacramentally also, and really, let him be accursed."

Here, then, is the difference. In the English Church, the presence of Christ in the sacrament is heavenly and spiritual; in the Roman Church, the presence is real, or material. Nor can it be otherwise in the two Churches. If the one denies transubstantiation, it can have only a spiritual presence in the sacrament. The other, on the contrary, with transubstantiation, can have any presence it pleases, and, in fact, has the real presence of Christ, not only altogether in the bread, but also altogether in the wine; and thus makes a present of two Christs to its priests at every mass they celebrate. Besides this, it has the real presence of Christ in all the consecrated wafers contained in its pyxes; so that sometimes, in a little vase, shut up in a foetid shrine (*ciborium*), is a family of some hundreds of Christs, all really and personally present. Moreover, such is the virtue of this transubstantion necromancy, that if the cup of wine happens to be thrown over, and the wine, while falling to the ground, spirits into a thousand drops, behold a thousand Christs spring up from it, since every separate drop contains a whole Christ. The same is the case with the wafer. If it were mischievously divided into a million fragments, visible to the naked eye, a million of Christs would not be wanting under those circumstances. In every visible fragment, even though no larger than a needle-point, a whole Christ, body, blood, soul, and divinity, would be found.

These are some of the consequences of transubstantiation, and they are logical enough in the Roman system, which is a system of cunning absurdity,

and hence a system of diabolical impiety; for were such miracles possible, they would belong only to the operations of Satan.* These consequences should suffice to assure Dr. Pusey that he is mistaken with Scotus—if, indeed, he is not aware that Scotus wrote against transubstantiation—in persuading himself that, “properly speaking, transubstantiation is not a change” (p. 228), or in feigning to doubt, with Thorndike, “whether it is a change destructive to the bodily substance of the elements, or cumulative of them” (p. 228). If there was no change, and if the substance of the elements was not destroyed, how could Christ be materially in the bread and in the wine, and entire in every fraction of the elements?

With a few eccentric exceptions, the English Church retains the spirit of its martyred reformers and keeps distinct from Rome in this doctrine of the real presence, which it receives in accordance with its Articles as celestial and spiritual, and this down to our own times. To put an end in a branch of the Church to this holy credence, the perverse section of Oxford labours secretly and mightily in the service of the arch tempter. The most daring of its Cyclops commenced the destruction of the spiritual edifice by means of Tract 90, which is to be regarded as the *chef-d'œuvre* of apostasy; and the rather that it was previously honoured with the vindication, and now enjoys the eulogiums, of the author of the EIRENICON (p. 301).

Subsequently, Pusey lent himself to the work of

* 2 Thes. ii. 9.

destruction and wrote his famous book, "The Doctrine of the Real Presence." But it is ever the same cunning—the cunning of Satan, which furnishes the weapons for accomplishing a labour so detestable. In that book, Pusey does not attempt to prove the real presence by means of the Bible. He knows well he could not prove it thus. The Word of God does not and cannot teach absurdity and blasphemy. He, however, proves his bad argument by what he calls the uninterrupted chain of the Fathers. Is it necessary that I should repeat, with regard to this subject, that when a dogma is not proved to be such by the Bible, it cannot be a dogma, even though a billion of Fathers agree unanimously to consider it as such?

But the worst of this sort of controversy is, that either from ignorance, or fear, or malice, or I know not what, Tractarians never can explain themselves so as to avoid coming into collision with the sense of the Articles, which admits of no grammatical gloss, seeing that it is grammatically clear and precise. Hence it is that Pusey's book seeks to prove the real presence by patristic consubstantiation; but at the same time, it cites the words of the Fathers in support of transubstantiation; then it assures us that "illustrations used by the Fathers imply sacramental change only;" and finally it peremptorily declares the real presence to be the doctrine of the English Church, which real presence the writer, on his part, calls objective (pp. 23, 228, 229).

Well, then, what are we to believe about this pre-

sence? Is it the presence of transubstantiation, or of consubstantiation, or of sacramentalism, or of objectivity? So long as you are unable to define it yourselves in opposition to Article 28, in which it is a celestial and spiritual presence, I can but look upon you as a party of blind men, who in a public-house parlour, stimulated by adulterated gin, deal heavy blows around, which, if they do not simply cut the air, break the heads of all the party indiscriminately.

It is true that in order to prove this objective presence (if the reader can construct anything from this *sesquipedalia verba*, he will find it a species of *olla podrida* of transubstantiation, of consubstantiation, and of sacramentalism, all together *et prosit*, if possible), Pusey cites in its favour a work "which received the sanction of two of our then archbishops" (p. 23). But although the work was approved and recommended by two Anglican archbishops, that proves nothing in the present controversy, since it is not on the authority of two archbishops that we shall accept the doctrine of the real presence. I say further, that their approbation of that work does not serve to prove that such is the doctrine of the English Church, as there might then be two archbishops as there had already been a Laud, and as there may be at the present day some Anglican prelate with absurd private opinions, not necessarily doctrines of the Church.*

* Pusey himself condemns his own argument. When speaking of M. Olier's book, he says (p. 104): "To me this seemed unintentional heresy, sanctioned by the two Gallican bishops who recommended the book." So much for the two Anglican archbishops!

What would Pusey say if, at some future time, a rationalist writer should cite Colenso and the Essayists, to prove that rationalism was approved and recommended by the English Church? It is necessary, then, to reason sensibly and seriously on such questions, and derive the doctrines of the Church from its Articles, and the dogma of the latter from the Bible alone, without any other authority.

Here it is that the writer of the book in question has failed. With regard to the Church of England, he utters the following blasphemy (p. 23): "Taking as her immutable foundation the words of Jesus Christ, 'This is my body—this is my blood of the New Covenant, and whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life,' he believes that the body or flesh, and the blood of Jesus Christ, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, both God and man, united indivisibly in one person, are verily and indeed given to, taken, eaten, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, under the outward sign or form of bread and wine, which is on this account the partaking or communion of the body and blood of Christ. He believes that the Eucharist is not the sign of an absent body, and that those who partake of it receive not merely the figure, or shadow, or sign of Christ's body, but the reality itself, and as Christ's divine and human natures are inseparably united, so he believes that we receive in the Eucharist, not only the flesh and blood of Christ, but Christ himself, both God and man."

In this quotation, Pusey finds his real objective presence firmly established; but, unfortunately for

him, the writer of this passage was not acquainted with the subject he wrote upon, and from absurd premises he could derive none but absurd consequences. That the writer did not know the subject upon which he was treating, is proved by his quotation of the sixth chapter of the Gospel according to John. The ignorant and fanatic always have recourse to that chapter to prove the material presence of Christ in the Sacrament; but the chapter is so far from speaking of the Lord's Supper, that the Tridentine Council itself, *mirabile dictu!* excludes it from its arguments in favour of transubstantiation. In fact, if that chapter must be taken in a material sense, so numerous and great are the moral and physical absurdities which would be the consequence, that truly the title of Incarnate Wisdom, which belongs exclusively to the divine Jesus, would be reduced simply to a satire. It is necessary, indeed, to be men of Capernaum to understand such things according to the flesh; but "the flesh profiteth nothing, it is the spirit which quickeneth."* Few understand the things of the spirit, and that is why such a great part of the world raves about the materiality of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament.

I shall not write a tract here to prove the foolish interpretation which Pusey, his author, and all the *presentialists* would give to the words of Christ: "This is my body; this is my blood." A man like Pusey, so familiar with the study of Hebrew and the Greek Testament, ought to know better than any one that the *to be* of the Bible is not always a substantive verb;

* John vi. 68.

and that in this passage, as in many others, it signifies grammatically only *to represent*. This is not cavilling, but philological accuracy.

Not to cite here some twenty cases or more which substantiate my proposition, it is sufficient for my purpose to give the most important parallel which I find in the whole Bible. I speak of the paschal lamb, which was a double type of the sacrifice and the sacrament of Christ. The Hebrews were commanded to eat it in these words : " Eat of it, for it is the Passover of the Lord." Let Pusey pay attention to this *it is*, which is the parallel of the *this is*. Now, I ask all the *presentialists* whether that lamb *was* the Passover? No; but it represented it. Did the Hebrews eat the Passover? No; they commemorated it. And so with the Lord's Supper, which, without the absurdity of a material presence, represents the body and blood of Christ, and recalls his death to mind until he comes again.

When Pusey endorses the non-authority of Palmer, and wishes it to be believed that " the Eucharist is not the sign of an absent body, and that those who partake of it receive not merely the figure, or shadow, or sign of Christ's body, but the reality itself . . . Christ himself both God and man," both fall under Cicero's reproach, which is, that the utmost point of folly which a man can reach, is that of eating his God.* If the real body of Christ exists in the Sacrament, it is no longer sacrament ; that is, conformably with the theory of Pusey elsewhere recorded, since the material presence of Christ in the Sacrament (p. 24) " overthrows the nature of a sacrament, in that the sign and

* De Nature Deorum.

the thing signified become the same." If Christ would give us his body, blood, soul, and divinity in material food, he should miraculously supply the markets, and not simply order it in a sacrament at church. But if it is a sacrament, it can be only the sign of the body of Christ, and the remembrance of his death. Where is the fool who wants a remembrance of a man who is present? If, then, the Sacrament is in remembrance of Christ, that is a proof that he is not materially present in the Sacrament.

Besides, a material presence (theological distinctions do not count a unit) is impossible with God himself. To say that God can do all things, does not mean that he can do what is impossible, which would destroy not only his infinite wisdom, but his very omnipotence. Now, according to the laws of God himself, a body, however glorious and spiritual, cannot be identically in two places at the same moment. If it did so find itself, in one of the two places, it would not be the identical person, but a fac-simile or appearance of it. It is, then, impossible, with absolute impossibility, for God himself so to act that the body of Christ, seated in heaven, glorified at the right hand of his eternal Father, should at the same time be materially present at all the Lord's Suppers celebrated by the faithful, and in every piece of sacramental bread eaten by them.

But speak, with the Article of the Church, about a celestial and spiritual presence, and you will proceed with logic, reason, and orthodoxy, although I can and do assert that that celestial and spiritual presence is a real presence. But while celestial and

spiritual, it cannot be a material presence, either of transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, or of objectivism, or of hyperphysicalism. "But if such were the case," writes one "'Vert," in his *musings* in the *Union Review*, "every English Catholic must feel that if God is not really present on our altars, we are the victims of a most fearful delusion."* Before responding to this puerile observation, I should like to know what is meant by the word "'Vert," that I may be aware with whom I have the honour of disputing. That the writer is an apostate, we have his own confession; *ergo*, one who has left the Church of biblical truth for that of Tridentine error; in which case alone consists apostacy, and not *vice versâ*. "'Vert," therefore, is an abbreviation of two words, which may be taken indifferently—convert and pervert; and I should wish to decide to which of the two categories the writer belongs, in order that the weight may be attached to his observations to which they are entitled. In not a few cases, we have men who are the victims of a fearful delusion; and why? Because they themselves have made the delusion, or they have believed it. In either case, the proverb applies: "He who causes his own evil must weep for himself." What passage of the Bible has authorized you to believe in a material presence of Christ? Not one. In spite of the Articles of the Church of England, you have made yourselves altars which do not exist. You seek to perpetuate on those altars the sacrifice of Golgotha, which was not to be

* Jan. 1866.

continued. You pretend that Christ is to descend upon those altars, according to the good pleasure of the priest; and when you discover that it is all a mere mania, then you cry out that you are the victims of a fearful delusion. Very well. But it is not we who have made the delusion; it is yourselves. We have done nothing but introduce the lamp of the divine Word into the camera-obscura of your ultramontane phantasmagoria, and the phantasmagoria has vanished to give place to the tears and disappointment of the babes and simpletons who took delight in it. This is your case.

What is there to make these Christ-eaters believe that they really eat Christ? Nothing but their own imagination. And as imagination does not work in all equally, and is not equally fervid in all temperaments and in all ages, so we have among these *Christophagists* a thousand kinds of scruples, doubts, uncertainty, coldness, which certainly are little calculated to do honour to the sacrament of the death of Christ. How much more simple and comforting is the spiritual presence! Faith takes the place of imagination, and faith, as demanded by the Article, teaches the communicant that Christ being given as food to the soul, and the soul being spiritual, therefore the food cannot be material, and the soul must receive Christ spiritually only. The faith of the communicant does not believe in the impossibility of a body not present; it makes Christ present in spirit, and thus, in a certain manner, doubles the spiritual presence of Christ in the Sacrament. And

thus the communicant partakes of the body of Christ without eating it, and has a true sacrament without absurdity.

In the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, then, there is no agreement between Articles and decrees ; hence the reunion of the two Churches is inadmissible.

C. *Sacrifice.*

The *Sacrifice* follows, to prove the discrepancy between Articles and decrees, and the inadmissibility of the reunion of the two Churches.

Article 31. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.* "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual ; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Council of Trent, Sess. 22, Canon 1. "If any one shall say that in the mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice, or that the offering is nothing else than that Christ has given up to eat, let him be accursed.

Canon 2. "If any one shall say that by these words, 'Do that in remembrance of me,' Christ did not constitute his Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed.

Canon 3. "If any one shall say that the sacrifice

of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise or thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made upon the cross, but not a propitiatory offering, or that it is profitable to the receiver alone, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed.

Canon 4. "If any one shall say that the most holy sacrifice of Christ, made upon the cross, is blasphemed by the sacrifice of the mass, or that the latter derogates from the former, let him be accursed."

From this it follows that the English Church, in the Sacrament, does not recognize a sacrifice; the Roman Church recognizes in it a true and proper sacrifice; *ergo*, they do not harmonize.

I first briefly show the absurdity of the sacrifice, and then I undertake to refute the cavils and sophisms of the EIRENICON as to the harmony of the two Churches.

The ordinances of Christ, called sacraments, cannot have a double nature; if the Eucharist were a sacrament and a sacrifice, it would have a double nature; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist cannot be a sacrifice.

That which is ordered to commemorate a thing can never be the thing commemorated. The sacrifice of the Eucharist was ordained by Christ to commemorate his sacrifice on Calvary; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist cannot be a sacrifice.

The representation of an event cannot, under any circumstance or restriction, assume the nature of

the event itself. The sacrament of the Eucharist was given, as alleged, to represent the sacrifice of Christ; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist cannot be, upon any pretext, a sacrifice.

In order that the sacrifice of the new law be true and proper, it must necessarily possess the double characteristic of an expiatory sacrifice and a propitiatory sacrifice; but the sacrament of the Eucharist would have only the characteristic of a propitiatory sacrifice; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice.

In order that the sacrifice may remit sins and their consequences, it must of necessity be a bloody one, or, as St. Paul positively declares, with shedding of blood. In the sacrament of the Eucharist the sacrifice is bloodless, or without shedding of blood; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice.

In order for the sacrifice to take place, there must be a sufficient cause to demand its necessity, as there can be no sacrifice without a cause, or uselessly. In the sacrament of the Eucharist there is no sufficient reason for a sacrifice, and therefore the sacrifice would be useless; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice.

In order that the sacrament of the Eucharist should be a sacrifice in the Church, it would be needful that the sacrifice of Calvary should not have been complete and perfect in all its parts of expiation and of propitiation; but the sacrifice of Calvary was perfect in every part; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice.

In order that the sacrament of the Eucharist should

be a true and proper propitiatory sacrifice, it must be supposed that Christ, in heaven, is insufficient for our perpetual propitiation; but Christ is sufficient for our perpetual propitiation; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice.

In order that the sacrament of the Eucharist should be a true and proper propitiatory sacrifice, the priest ministering in the person of Christ must, like him, bear the character of mediator; but Christ is the only mediator between God and man, and has not delegated this exclusive office to any one; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice.

In order that the sacrament of the Eucharist should be a true and proper sacrifice, it would be necessary to have the same victim and the same mode of oblation as formerly upon Calvary; but Christ can no more be a victim, in any sense, even figurative; and the mode of oblation, even according to the Tridentine terms (Chap. II.), is changed; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrifice.

In order that the sacrament of the Eucharist should be a sacrifice, it would be necessary either that Christ, in heaven, should be without the merit of his sacrifice, or that his own presence should not, *per se*, be the continual oblation of the said sacrifice before the Father for our propitiation, or that the Father should accept it only through the interposition of the Church and priests; but the merit of the sacrifice is inseparable from Christ, and perpetually intercedes for us by its own excellence, without the interference of the Church, and without the help of men; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist is not a sacrament.

Deus nihil frustra agit; but if the sacrament of the Eucharist was a duplicate or a continuation of the sacrifice of Calvary, God would have instituted a useless ordinance in the Church, as Christ himself suffices for all our necessities; *ergo*, the sacrament of the Eucharist cannot be and is not a true and proper sacrifice. And if it is not a true and proper sacrifice, it is only a farce, a deception and insult, a sacrilege, a blasphemy; *ergo*, "the sacrifice of masses are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Quod erat probandum, and which I have proved. Therefore the doctrine of the Tridentine decrees is inadmissible; and, therefore, the reunion of the two Churches is fallacious.

But Pusey is persuaded "that, on this point, the two Churches might be reconciled by explanation of the terms used" (p. 28). I, on the other hand, insist upon their irreconcilableness, and will prove it by means of the sophisms of Pusey himself.

"The doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice depends upon the doctrine of the real objective presence. Where there is the apostolic succession and a consecration in our Lord's words, there, it is held by Roman authorities too, is the Eucharistic sacrifice. The very strength of the expressions used of 'the sacrifices of the masses,' that 'they were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' the use of the plural, and the clause, 'in the which it was commonly said,' show that what the Article speaks of, is not 'the sacrifice of the mass,' but the habit (which, as one hears from time to time, still remains) of trusting to the purchase of masses when dying, to the neglect of a

holy life, or repentance, and the grace of God, and his mercy in Christ Jesus, while in health." (Pp. 25, 26.)

Sophism the first.—"The doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice depends upon the doctrine of the real objective presence." But the real objective presence is a mere imagination, an illusion, a chimera, the delirium of unsound or fanatic minds; *ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrifice is nothing but fable and deceit.

Proof.—It has been elsewhere shown, that if there was the real objective presence, it would be destructive of the true nature of the Eucharistic sacrament, which was instituted only to signify, and not really to be, the body of Christ. If there is not the nature, or essence, or quality of a sacrament, there can, in reality, be no sacrifice; *ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrifice, which depends upon the "real objective presence," is nothing else than a sophism.

Sophism the second.—"Where there is the apostolic succession and a consecration in our Lord's words, there, it is held by Roman authorities too, is the Eucharistic sacrifice;" but as the apostolic succession is not the succession of Christ in his offices of Messiah, and as the consecration, in the words of the Lord, do not produce the real objective presence; *ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrifice is a fable and deceit.

Proof.—Given, as hypothesis, that the apostolic delegation, rather than the evangelical delegation, was to be transmitted in the Church, and given that it could be demonstrated that this apostolic succession existed in some Churches, it could still not be proved that the successors of the Apostles have an authority which the Apostles themselves never had

nor could have; the authority of offering Christ in sacrifice—an offering which could be made only by himself—an offering which, when once made by him, was not to be and could not be repeated. On this account, the New Testament has no priests, in the legitimate sense of the word, which signifies sacrificers. The office of priest had become useless (there being no longer any sacrifice), and was not meant to continue. On the other hand, it has already been scripturally demonstrated that the words of consecration by no means imply the real objective presence, but rather exclude it; since they declare the bread and wine represent, or signify, or symbolize, only the body and blood of Christ; *ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrifice, which depends upon apostolic succession and upon the words of consecration, is nothing else than sophism.

Abyssus abyssum invocat. Pusey, the better to support the sophism, adduces the authority of the Roman Church, which makes the Eucharistic sacrifice depend upon apostolic succession and consecration, in our Lord's words. But as, in the present question, we deny the doctrine of the sacrifice as declared by the Roman Church, so to adduce in favour of the sacrifice the precise authority which we deny, is nothing less in logic than to add sophism to sophism to crown the fallacy.

Nor does the crown lack its dominant gem. After having spoken negatively and explained what his Church prohibits, Dr. Pusey proceeds to declare that "the Church of England, acknowledging the belief of the Fathers, whose teaching we are required to

follow, the doctrine of the councils, which it recognizes as 'received by all men,' receives what they taught" (p. 26). In this paragraph, there is not a line free from error; therefore it is a paragraph of sophisms. I deny that the English Church ought to follow the teaching of the Fathers; if it did, it would be a Church of human and not divine orthodoxy. I deny that the English Church receives what the Fathers teach. The English Church, according to the tenor of its 6th Article, receives only that which can be proved from the Bible. And as the 28th Article says that transubstantiation is repugnant to the Bible, and the mass is a fable and deceit, so even though the Fathers taught transubstantiation and the mass, the English Church not only does not receive their teaching, but requires its followers to reject it. I could here prove afresh to Pusey that the greater part of the Fathers never dreamed either of transubstantiation or of consubstantiation; and that, in speaking of the sacramental presence, they understood nothing but the celestial and spiritual presence of the English Church. With such teaching, we certainly have not the real objective presence and through it the Eucharistic sacrifice. I prefer, however, to call Pusey's attention to his contradiction, or if not contradiction, sophism. In the note appended to this sonorous declaration, he quotes the words of Convocation, A.D. 1571, which run thus: "They (preachers) shall, in the first place, be careful never to teach anything from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and

uttered out of that very doctrine by the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops" (*Ib.*). Now, very well, my dear Doctor; what the people ought to believe is, not the doctrine which the Fathers taught, but that which is found to be in conformity with the Bible; that which the Fathers and the councils gathered from the Bible. Then the doctrine which the English Church receives is the doctrine of the Bible alone, though taught by the Fathers and councils. But the Bible is opposed to the Eucharistic sacrifice; *ergo*, the English Church cannot receive the doctrine either from Fathers or councils, as it would be their doctrine, and not doctrine collected from the Bible. Let Pusey remember that even councils may err, and not presume to make us receive through them teachings which may be erroneous.

If I were asked why Pusey and his party insist so much upon our following the teachings of Fathers and councils, I should briefly answer that Pusey and his party see that they cannot prove this fable and deceit of the Roman Church, and which they wish to introduce into the English Church, on the authority of the Bible; they therefore seek to make up for the want by the authority of Fathers and councils, which they suppose to be in their favour. This was the object of the book published by Pusey, "The Real Objective Presence proved from the Fathers." Hence, whenever these Ultramontanists succeed in persuading Churchmen, *bonâ fide*, that they are obliged by their Church to follow the teaching of the Fathers, and that the teaching of the Fathers recognizes the Eucharistic sacrifice, they will obtain

the reception of the Eucharistic sacrifice, in accordance with patristic recommendation, although both recommendation and sacrifice are fallacies, and those who propose them are also fallacious.

Sophism the third.—The Eucharistic sacrifice cannot be prohibited, as it does not belong to the “sacrifices of masses” condemned by the English Article. But the Eucharistic sacrifice belongs to the “sacrifice of the masses” condemned by the English Article; *ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrifice is a fable and deceit.

Proof.—In order to demonstrate that the Eucharistic sacrifice cannot be prohibited by the Article, Dr. Pusey dips his pen in grammatical cavils to bring forth logical sophisms (p. 25): “The very strength of the expressions used of ‘the sacrifices of the masses,’ that ‘they were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,’ the use of the plural, and the clause ‘in which it was commonly said,’ then that what the Article speaks of, is not ‘the sacrifice of the mass’ but the habit—of trusting to the purchase ‘of masses when dying.’” Firstly, I observe that there is an inaccuracy in the quotation. The old edition of the Prayer Book, which I consult in this controversy, does not say “the sacrifices of masses,” but “the sacrifice of masses.” Had the Reformers made use of the expression “sacrifices of masses,” they would have shown a want of common sense. Although the masses daily celebrated amounted to the number of a million, yet they would never speak of the “sacrifices of the masses,” but the sacrifice of the masses, since the sacrifice is but one; and it is the same in all. Dr. Pusey, then, must permit me frankly to deny his first assertion, which,

according to my old Prayer Book, would be called a species of theological forgery.

But when the Article speaks of the "sacrifice of masses," it speaks accurately, and, in its accuracy, excludes the Eucharistic sacrifice. If the Reformers had said, "the sacrifice of the mass," as Pusey would make them say, they would have given proof of superlative ignorance. If it were the custom in the Roman Church to celebrate but one mass every day, or only once a year, as the High Priest entered once a year into the holy of holies; if the Pope in person, or some one delegated by him, celebrated that single mass, then it might be correct to use the expression, "the sacrifice of the mass." But when more than one mass is celebrated, even though there were but two in Christendom, it would always be correct to say "the sacrifice of masses." The question, then, with the Reformers was, not so much of number as of object. And where, with regard to number, they condemn "the sacrifice of the masses," with regard to object, they condemn every kind of Eucharistic sacrifice.

In order that Dr. Pusey may find nothing beyond the rules of good grammar in the 28th Article, I beg him to observe that the clause "in the which it was commonly said," does not refer to the plural "masses," but to the singular "sacrifice;" on which account he has no need to have recourse to the subterfuge that, in this clause, the Article cannot speak against the mass. Let Pusey not change "sacrifice" into "sacrifices," nor think "mass" necessary to grammar instead of "masses," and he will then find his grammatical cavil sink below zero. The Eucharistic sacrifice,

then, in order to sustain which such quibbling is necessary, is nothing but a sophism.

Sophism the fourth.—The Sacrament, then, might pass in part as a Eucharistic sacrifice, if it were necessary to the application of the one meritorious sacrifice of the cross ; but the Sacrament is not necessary to the application of the sacrifice of the cross ; *ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrifice is nothing but fable and deceit.

Proof.—Dr. Pusey hopes, by quoting the Lutheran Pfaff, to be able to make the theory of application pass. It is truly strange that Pusey should have recourse for arguments to a Church condemned by him as rationalistic, and which he has excluded from the benefits of the reunion. It is strange, moreover, that he quotes the opinion of an isolated individual to sustain a proposition so anti-dogmatic, when he himself demands on such questions the authoritative declaration of the Church. It is strange, finally, that he seeks support for his opinion from a man whose confession of faith, with regard to the Eucharist, is based upon the absurd error of consubstantiation, or the panification of Christ. He who professes an error cannot be cited for truth.*

But our question is still graver. Pusey chooses altogether to ignore the ugly trick practised by the Tridentine Fathers in their decrees and canons, by means of which they said two different things at one and the same time, in order that both the discordant parties might be satisfied, and they might reserve

* Luth. Conf. 1577.

for their corollaries the future dogmatism of the Roman Church. In the same manner, the Council, in the decrees which precede its canons, or in the preambles of its decrees, often expresses apostolic doctrine which it soon after retracts, suppresses, or radically changes in the injunction of its canons, which alone define Catholic dogma under the fulmination of anathema.

It may be that amidst a barbarous construction of words, the Tridentine Council, in the first chapter of its twenty-second Session, means to express something similar to this application when it says: "Our Lord, in order that he might leave to the Church a visible sacrifice, whereby that bloody sacrifice which was to be once accomplished on the cross, might be repeated and its memory abide to the end of the world, and its salutary efficacy be applied to the remission of our daily sins, declaring himself a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedeck, offered to God the Father his body and blood under the forms of bread and wine." But this is the question only before the scenes. Let us look at it behind the scenes, and we shall have the true signification of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which is nothing else than the sacrifice of the mass under a name apparently more Protestant.

Canon 1, the Council defines: "If any one shall say that in the mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice, let him be accursed;" *ergo*, it is not a sacrifice of representation only.

Canon 2, the Council declares: "If any one shall say that by these words, 'do this in remembrance of me,' Christ did not ordain that they (Apostles) and

other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed ;” *ergo*, it is not a sacrifice of remembrance only.

Canon 3 establishes : “If any one shall say that the sacrifice of the mass is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made upon the cross, but not a propitiatory offering . . . and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfaction, and other necessities, let him be accursed ;” *ergo*, it is not a sacrifice of application only.

From the canons of Trent, then, we have a true and proper sacrifice—a sacrifice propitiatory *in itself*, a sacrifice to be offered for the living and the dead, to take away sins, punishments, and make satisfaction, or perform any other necessity of life. *Ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrifice of *mere application* of that of Golgotha is, in the Council of Trent, a farce, and in Dr. Pusey and all the EIRENICONISTS “a fable and deceit.”

What need was there in the Church for a continued visible sacrifice to *apply* the meritorious sacrifice of Calvary? None whatever. Christ, then, could not institute anything so useless as the Eucharistic sacrifice. The homilies themselves—to which Pusey loves to have recourse—assure us of this great truth—the non-necessity of the Eucharistic sacrifice. They tell us : “Herein there needeth no other man’s help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no mass, no means established by man’s invention. That faith is a necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies we may thus assure ourselves.”* Do you understand these

* The first part of Sermon concerning the Sacrament.

solemn words, "no other sacrifice, no oblation, no sacrificing priest, no mass?" What, then, is your Eucharistic sacrifice, in the language of your homilies themselves? A mere human invention! But it is worse than invention—it is a sophism. Were it ever heard, in logic or in theology, that, in order to apply a sacrifice, another sacrifice is necessary? In that case, why not leave the first open, in order to transmit it in continual succession to the end of the world? From this it would follow that, although the very office for which the Eucharist was established by Christ was that of applying to the communicant the propitiation made by Christ by the one meritorious sacrifice of the cross, yet the Eucharist, to fulfil such office, ought not to assume the nature of a sacrifice itself, but retain its own nature of a sacrament. If, according to the definition adopted by Pusey (p. 20), the sacraments are "channels of grace, or visible signs of an invisible grace," the sacrament of the Eucharist cannot be a sacrifice. It cannot be a sacrifice, because it would be at the same time the sign and the thing signified. It cannot be a sacrifice, because it would be no longer the channel, but the source of grace. It cannot be a sacrifice, because it would be no longer the visible sign of an invisible grace, but it would be the visible grace of an invisible sign; *ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrifice, which claims existence under the pretext that it is the application of the sacrifice of Calvary, is nothing but a sophism.

Let no one be surprised to find Pusey and his party, and, indeed, the whole of English ultramontaniam, wild upon this sacrificial blasphemy. In this

they are already in agreement, and already united with Rome, who well knows, if deprived of the Eucharistic sacrifice, her priests would lose their impious authority as *fac-simile* of God, and with it their popular sacrilegious reverence as manufacturers of Christ. Indeed, to what would the ministry of these Tractarian clergymen be reduced if they were not sacrificing priests? and how could they be sacrificing priests if they did not offer an oblation? and how could they offer an oblation without the existence of an altar? and how could an altar exist without a sacrifice? and how could there be a sacrifice without a victim? and how could there be a victim unless it were supplied by the Eucharistic sacrament? *Ergo*, the Eucharistic sacrament must, of necessity, be the Eucharistic sacrifice, otherwise all the majesty of the Tractarian sacerdotaly tumbles from its stilts, and becomes simply evangelical ministry. And thus the EIRENICON and its party would finally discover the *rara avis*, or the Arabian phoenix, which, as Metastasio sings, every one says exists, but where it is nobody knows.* Let us leave them to toy with their fabulous bird while they fancy they hold it in their hands. When once it dies, by the sentence of the English Church and people, they will certainly never be able to revive it from its ashes through the funeral pile of stoles, and chasubles, and copes, supplied by the warehouses of Pratt, Little, and Brangwyn; nor through the incantations of turnings, and gesticulations, and genuflexions, with accompaniment of incense and holy water, as suggested by the *Directorium*

* "Che vi sia ciascun lo dice,
Dove sia nessun lo sa."

Anglicanum; nor through the funereal dirge brayed forth in genuine Gregorian chant over the burning pyre, as found in the "Little Sacrament Book," or in the "Altar Book." Poor phoenix! *Requiescat in pace!* Amen!

This mania for Eucharistic sacrifice has so taken possession of the ultramontanist sect, that it is now a thing inseparable from it—a sort of "to be or not to be" of Tractarianism. In this the author of Tract 90, and Pusey, his apologist, have cause to congratulate themselves that their party is like a flock of sheep, which, when one of its number takes a fancy to fly, is followed by all the rest, though they know not why or wherefore. I find the mania of the Eucharistic sacrifice in the ultramontanist sect penetrates into details and the most insignificant minutiae. I will quote one fact among thousands. A devout poetess of the party has recently sung the marvels of the Sacrament in verse, in a book entitled "Hymns on the Holy Communion." What glory for the sect to see its Prudentius, its Gregory of Nazianzus, its Lactantius Firmianus, and Thomas Aquinas, revive in its midst in petticoats; and yet, for the Apollos of the *Union Review*, this soprano poet is nothing more than an insolent Marcia. With the implacable blade of deadly criticism they subject the canorous daughter of Albion to a renewal of the cruelties practised upon Marcia, tear off her skin from head to foot, and ruthlessly abandon her to derision, bereft of her cuticle.

And why such barbarity? The following is the verdict of the Apollos who perform their assize circuit in a car drawn by moles: "The great defect of this book, however, is the utter absence of conception

of the sacrificial aspect of the holy Eucharist. . . . The sacrifice is unwittingly ignored, and this, too, in the face of what is so distinctly said of this sacrament in the Church Catechism, viz., ‘that it was intended first for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ.’” * Behold the crime, the verdict, and the sentence! Let the pious poetess console herself, however, since the English who reason will find, in her silence with regard to the sacrifice, only apt reason to admire her discretion and common sense. I certainly would not exchange her petticoat for all the gowns and caps of the *Union Review*. In the first place, upon so grave a subject, it is not the Catechism which ought to be consulted, but the Articles of the Confession of Faith; and the Articles contain absolutely nothing with regard to the sacrifice.

In the second place, if the Catechism teaches that the Sacrament was given “for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ,” any one must have a good dose of stupidity—which I am glad not to notice in the devout poetess—to ignore that a thing ordained in remembrance of another is not the same as the thing remembered, and that, consequently, the Eucharist cannot be, by any means, a sacrifice, or have the nature of a sacrifice, or any sacrificial aspect, but that it must remain in its condition of sacrament. Oh! if the singer of the hymns on the Holy Communion had but imitated the Greek Sappho on this point, and precipitated herself headlong from this Leucadian stone into the abyss of the

* *Union Review*, No. XIX., p. 115.

Eucharistic sacrifice, at this hour she might already be proclaimed by the Apolloses in priestly cape as the eleventh muse of the Tractarian Olympus.

D. *Communion.*

On this point the discrepancy between Articles and decrees is equally striking.

Article 30. *Of both Kinds.* "The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people; for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike."

Council, Sess. 21, Canon 1. "If any one shall say that by the commandment of God, or as necessary to salvation, all and each of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both kinds of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, let him be accursed.

Canon 2. "If any one shall say that the holy Catholic Church has not been induced by just causes and reasons to communicate to the laity, and even to the clergy who do not officiate, only the kind of bread, or that she has erred in so doing, let him be accursed.

Canon 3. "If any one shall deny that the whole and entire Christ, the fountain and author of all graces, is received under the one kind of bread, because, as some falsely assert, he is not there received according to Christ's own institution, under both kinds, let him be accursed."

Does it appear difficult to find discord between these two opposite documents? I shall not avail myself of the complacency of Du Pin (p. 230), who

"would have the reception 'in both kinds,' or 'in one kind only,' left free to each Church." No, gentlemen. Either the Sacrament consists of two parts, or it does not. If not, why did Christ so order it at the last paschal supper, and make one whole of the two in his institution? If it does, how dare you leave each Church free to adopt only one?

Observe, that in the Church of Rome this and other blasphemies are consistent with its system of absurd transubstantiation. If the bread is no longer the symbol of the body of Christ, but is the body of Christ, as there can be no body without blood, so in the bread the body and blood of Christ are received. And because a body, and not a corpse, is spoken of, so with the bread Christ is received—body, blood, and soul. And as the two natures of Christ are necessarily united in his person by hypostasis, so with the bread, Christ the Man-God is received. In that case, as every one sees, there is no need of the cup to have a true and proper sacrament, since even without the wine, and with the bread alone, the whole of Christ is received. But transubstantiation in logic, in physics, and in the Bible is the absurdity of absurdities; *ergo*, to deny the cup to the laity is perfect blasphemy, as the laity is thus deprived of the sacrament.

The bread constitutes but a half sacrament; a half sacrament is no sacrament at all; *ergo*, the Church without the cup has no sacrament. If in baptism the ordinance of Christ cannot be changed, and wine substituted for water, neither in the Eucharist can the terms of the institution be changed, and one of the two elements necessary to constitute it a sacra-

ment be suppressed. The reasons and the just causes which the Roman Church had for withdrawing the cup from the laity reduce themselves simply to the impious absurdity of its transubstantiation. Lest any should drink too much and intoxicate themselves with the blood of Christ, which would dishonour its doctrine of the change of substance, or lest any one should suffer a drop of wine to fall to the ground, and thus let a whole Christ fall, which would expose Christ to profanation, the Church thought of withholding the cup, and thus preventing all cause of anxiety and scandal in both parts. But the sacrament was thus destroyed for the laity. What would become of the Anglican-Catholic who, accustomed to the cup in his own country, should go to Rome after the reunion of the two Churches, and should receive a little host, or even a quarter of a little host—which is often the case when the communicants are more than the hosts—without partaking of the cup of the Lord? Used in his own country to the sacrament, both in bread and wine, would he think he received the sacrament at Rome in a single mite of host? What would he have gained by the reunion? The loss of the cup, and with it the loss of the Eucharistic sacrament! A reunion in such terms is altogether worthy of the EIRENICON.

E. Adoration.

Article 28. "The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

Council, Sess. 13, Canon 6. "If any one shall say,

that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored even with the external worship of Latria, which is due to the true God, and, therefore, that it is not to be venerated with peculiar festive celebration ; nor to be solemnly carried about in procession, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy Church ; or not to be publicly presented to the people to be adored by them, and that its adorers are idolaters, let him be accursed."

As usual, Articles and decrees meet to clash. Each opposing party may be satisfied—the Christians of the English Church with the Articles, the Pagans of Romanism and Tractarianism with the decrees.

It must be confessed that all this idolatry, decreed under pain of anathema by the Tridentine Council, is nothing but a logical consequence of the theological absurdity of transubstantiation. When once Christ is in the sacrament—body, blood, soul, and divinity—it is by no means strange that the Roman Church should be anxious to retain him and honour him with every kind of adoration and pomp. But, as transubstantiation is a "fable and deceit," so all the adoration paid to the Eucharist is nothing less, in the measured gentle language of the English Church, than abominable idolatry.

As I have no wish to soil myself with such impious abomination, I will lose no further time in confuting the idolatry of the sacrifice-sacrament, but shall divert the reader, instead, with some of the results obtained through this papistic doctrine of adoration.

I begin with the "sacrament to be reserved." A sacrament which is reserved or preserved must be of the same nature as mushrooms and gherkins pickled and preserved for the use of the table and the kitchen ; such is the familiar idea of anything preserved for eating. Without doubt, we have also mummies preserved, insects preserved, and reptiles preserved for the use of museums of natural history, and for schools of comparative anatomy ; as elsewhere we have diseased skins preserved, tubercles and calculi preserved, and cancers preserved for the lecture theatres and the study of pathology. But this sort of preserves cannot be produced as a specimen of the preserved sacrament. The former are of dead materials and not eatable, while this is a preserve of a living body, to be eaten at the right time by Christophagists.

Some may be inclined to think that I am urging the argument to an undue point of sarcasm ; but they do me an injustice. I am doing nothing more than simply register the results naturally arising from the doctrine of preservation. If the Ultramontanists are offended at the indecency of these remarks against their sacrament, let them cease to preserve it, and the indecency will cease.

And here, in order that Protestants, who know so little of practical Romanism that it is too easily introduced among them, may know how Papists preserve the sacrament, I will, for their instruction, describe the way and place. The place is the church, or, if private, the chapel, which has been licensed by Rome for the purpose. Without a special privilege, such chapels cannot preserve the sacrament. The manner or

the how of the preservation is simple enough to be at once understood by all. The host or the hosts, which are no longer such except in appearance, having been transubstantiated into the living body of Christ, is shut up in a pyx, the cup of which, at least, should be silver, though it is frequently nothing more than silver brass—a sham, to contain another sham even more solemn. The pyx, then, is shut up in a sort of box, which opens in front with a little door, which box is called a tabernacle, or, more properly, a *ciborium*, because it contains the *cibus animæ*, or the pickled sacrament.

Now these tabernacles or *ciboria* are of every kind, from precious stones and the richest marble down to plaster and the commonest wood. And such is their difference internally. While some are lined with silk and the most costly embroidery, others are decorated with dirty, torn, ill-smelling linings. And here Christ the King of glory has to remain shut up, at the pleasure of priests, generally without a single visitor the whole week. No one thinks of him except on the Sunday, and the Papists willingly leave him alone in company with his angels, who, the priests make it appear, are there in immense numbers in the dark; probably packed like herrings in a barrel. It is fortunate for Christ that he cannot be in two places at once, and that, therefore, he is not obliged to leave the throne which he occupies in heaven at the right hand of his Eternal Father, to descend and dwell within certain *ciboria* in which a toad would not have its hole.

In these *ciboria* Christ would be subjected, in the

reserved sacrament, to the most shameful treatment and the most ignominious consequences, if he were truly reserved in the said sacrament. I do not speak of the irreverence committed before him, or of the way in which some think to honour him when they make him a half genuflexion, just like the soldiers of the pretorian band, when he gave himself into their hands for our redemption. But I speak of the preservation itself. How often does it happen that the wafers, from the dampness of the climate, or of the *ciborium*, become mouldy, decay, and produce worms of the most disgusting appearance! Behold, then, Christ's body subjected to opprobrium; and God, who would not allow his holy One, after death, to see the corruption of the grave, now should permit the Church to cause the living body of his Christ to become corrupt and breed worms!! But it may be observed, that though the hosts thus putrify, that is no reason that the body of Christ corrupts. Why not? Because they are only the species or the appearance of bread. But the species or appearance of a body cannot corrupt; it is only the substance which becomes corrupt. Now, you say that by transubstantiation the substance of bread has been changed into the substance of Christ—*ergo*, that which corrupts in the "sacrament reserved" is the substance of Christ—*ergo*, to reserve the sacrament is worse than infamous; it is impious. It is thought to avoid the charge of impiety by alleging that, when the host corrupts, Jesus Christ ceases to be in the sacrament. But this is only a double contradiction. When the bread has once become Christ, it cannot

again become bread. If the test has been found to prove that the bread becomes the body of Christ, let the test also be found to prove that, given certain circumstances, the body of Christ again becomes bread. If the theory be admitted that the body of Christ disappears upon the corruption of the host, it may be asked what is the true and precise point of corruption at which the host distransubstantiates and obliges Christ to flee from its putrefaction? But perhaps you admit, with regard to the sacrament reserved, the theory of the dissolving views, or the gradual disappearance of the body of Christ in proportion as the corruption of the host augments and develops.

The hosts, on their part, are subjected to many indignities. They are frequently stolen by thieves, who know not what to do with them, the object of their robbery being the pyx and not the host; they throw them away, therefore, just where it is most convenient to themselves—sometimes on dunghills; sometimes they are carried away with the wind, no one knows where; sometimes they are smelt and nibbled, or even entirely eaten, by mice. But the mice which eat the hosts, it may be objected, do not eat Christ. How so? If the host is Christ, the mice which eat the host must eat Christ. No, you reply, because Christ is no longer in the host. Who knows that? who can affirm it? Are you playing at a game of Christ who is and who is not in the host? He is there if eaten by a Judas, he is not there if eaten by a mouse. I will prove, however, that he is there. Supposing that a mouse eats but half a host, in the

half that remains the Roman Church recognizes the entire living body of Christ. The same body, then, must also have been eaten by the mouse with the other half, the two halves being integral parts of the host. Will it be asserted that Christ was half in the host and half not, precisely as the moon appears to us sometimes half visible and half not? All that is good for Papists and Puseyites, but not for Christians, who are guided by the Word of God!

I shall conclude this limited list of the blasphemies resulting from this doctrine of preservation by choosing from among many the following fact, which occurred in Naples during the first French invasion. Some Papist Jacobins having decoyed a priest to celebrate mass before the goddess of Reason, forced him to give a portion of the host to a gigantic toad, which they placed for the purpose upon the altar. The priest complied, half dead with fright, amid the laughter and jeers of the Papist profanators. Such is the advantage of the reserved sacrament.

Another consequence of Tridentine transubstantiation is the latria worship decreed to the sacrament in exposing it to the adoration of Catholics, and its being adored by them. But as the Tridentine transubstantiation is nothing but "fable and deceit," so, with accurate language, the English Church calls the adoration of the sacrament abominable idolatry.

It is quite incomprehensible to me that Pusey, who has taken such pains to prove the agreement of Articles and decrees in everything relating to transubstantiation, presence, sacrifice, and communion, should say not a single word as to their agreement on the

point of adoration. As the reader may see, while it is a thing of the utmost importance, the most complete discrepancy exists between the two Churches with regard to it. In the one, it is latriac worship (or worship of God); in the other, it is abominable idolatry.

Pusey, perhaps, is of opinion, that as he himself has proved the real objective presence of Christ in the sacrament, a true adoration is due to it, according as we see it practised in reality at the present day by the ultramontanists of his party when they celebrate their supposititious mass upon their bastard altars; but as the Puseyitic consubstantiation is nothing but "fable and deceit," so, in the accurate language of the true English Church, the Tractarian adoration of the sacrament is nothing but abominable idolatry.

But, some may object, to adore God is not idolatry. In the sacrament, God is adored in the person of Christ; *ergo*, the adoration of the sacrament is not idolatry. I deny the minor of the syllogism, or that, in the sacrament, God is adored. Where is Christ in the sacrament so that he can be adored? He is there. Who assures me of that? Faith. On what authority? Upon the authority of Christ himself. When and how given? In the words of consecration. Very well; that is your proof. But the words of consecration by no means authorize the belief of Christ's material presence in the sacrament, but, on the contrary, forbid the idea of any material presence; *ergo*, the adoration of the sacrament is abominable idolatry.

That cannot be. If there exists a faith which

believes firmly in the true and proper presence of Christ in the sacrament, this, of itself, suffices to exclude idolatry. But who can call stupefaction faith? When any one believes a thing not revealed in the Bible, and not revealed because it is impossible; when, indeed, any one believes a thing so repugnant to the Bible as transubstantiation, such credence is not an act of faith, but simply an act of stupidity. It is not the *rationabile obsequium fidei* which believes in such presence, but stupefied reason which receives and accepts it. The act of stupefaction, however, by no means nullifies the sin of idolatry, but rather increases it, inasmuch as, in order to believe an absurdity, man must suppress and reject the noblest gift of God to the creature—intellect; *ergo*, the adoration of the sacrament, although paid under the pretence of the presence of Christ, is nothing but abominable idolatry.

And the idolatry is worse if it is considered on the side of the form, or of the sacramental symbols, or elements. Idolatry is not only the adoration of other gods besides the one Creator, according to the first commandment of the Decalogue, but it is also the adoration of God, even the one true God, under any material form. Thus, we call the Persian an idolater who worships the great God under the form of the sun, which is the most magnificent creation of the firmament; and we call the Fetishier an idolater who worships the invisible God under the form of a tree, which is the finest creation of the sublunary world. For the same reason the Catholic, whether Roman or Anglican, is an idolater who, the better to adore

Christ, represents him as crucified. The image even of the crucifix, with a view to worship, is nothing but abomination in the sight of God, being, as it is, of the nature of idolatrous worship. What cavils, then, could defend from idolatry the worship paid to the sacrament under the sacramental symbols?

To this it is impudently answered, 'that, in the sacrament, there is no longer the substance of bread (the same may be said of the wine), it having been transubstantiated into the substance of Christ, so that nothing but the appearance of bread remains; the worship which is paid to the substance terminates in Christ himself, and is, therefore, true latriac worship, and in no respect idolatry. I shall not stop here to prove that God, being a Spirit, must be worshipped in spirit, and that his worship necessarily excludes every material appearance; but I shall take as my argument against the adoration of the sacrament this very appearance of bread. You admit that it is the appearance of bread; what you see is the appearance of bread; what you expose to the public is the appearance of bread; what you carry about with processional pomp is the appearance of bread. The appearance of bread, though only the appearance, is a form of existence; under that form, you adore Christ in the sacrament; to adore God under any form is abominable idolatry; *ergo*, the adoration of the sacrament is abominable idolatry.

But there is something still worse. To keep to the argument invented by Pusey to facilitate the reconciliation, the substance of bread remains intact in the sacrament, although called by the name of "acci-

dents" in the Roman Church (p. 24); *ergo*, in the sacrament there is the substance of bread. That bread is decreed for public adoration; *ergo*, the adoration of that bread is true and perfect idolatry. Christ is adored in that sacramental bread; *ergo*, the adoration of Christ in the sacrament is abominable idolatry.

In this idolatry, the Catholics of both Churches show themselves more brutishly stupid than the votaries of any other idolatry. Though the adoration of God in the sun is idolatry, the sun is a magnificent idol for adoration. Though the adoration of God in trees is idolatry, yet trees are beautiful idols to idolize. The idolatry of the crucifix, and worse still the idolatry of the cross, may find a pretence of sense in material and ignorant hearts from the representation of Christ in the act of accomplishing human redemption, although it must ever be idolatry. But the adoration of God under the form of bread—and not even common bread, which might remind of our daily beneficent aliment, but of bread in the shape of a host—is everything that is most vile, and stupid, and wicked, that can be invented to render the idolaters more especially abominable in the eyes of God. Christ adored under the form a wafer—a wafer which only serves at a ball as a spoon with which to eat jellies, and has no office in common life but to seal letters! And they fulminate curses against those who refuse latriac adoration to such an idol! How long will God tolerate such filthy idolatry among his creatures? Is it to prostrate himself before this kind of idol that Pusey solicits reunion with Rome?

All that I have written above, with regard to the

idolatrous adoration of the sacrament, presupposes the belief that Christ is really present in the sacrament, and that, notwithstanding his true presence, to adore him under sacramental forms, is nothing less than truly a sin of idolatry.

I now advance another step in the path of Tridentine abomination to discover that, according to the doctrine of the Roman Church itself, it may be the case that Christ is not present. I would beg Pusey to acquaint himself with this doctrine, of which he seems totally ignorant, when he speaks of the Eucharistic sacrifice, provided there be the words of consecration. When the priest who celebrates mass has not the intention of consecrating, although he actually pronounces the words of consecration as formerly pronounced by Christ, transubstantiation does not take place, and hence Christ is not present in the sacrament.

Observe the advantages of belonging to the Church of Rome! Notwithstanding the *opus operatum*, according to which it should suffice that the sacraments be administered mechanically in obedience to the forms prescribed by the Church, the better to accredit its priests and prove the necessity for them and their authority, the Church has invented the subterfuge that there is no sacrament, if the intention of the priest who administers it is wanting. Thus, a Roman Catholic can never be sure that he was really baptized, not being sure that it was the intention of the priest to baptize him. If the intention failed on the part of the baptizing priest, his baptism was worth less than the first washing given him by his nurse. The same is to be said of the Eucharistic sacrament. The

Roman Catholic can never be sure, with physical or moral certainty, that the celebrant priest has the intention of consecrating, and if he has not the intention to consecrate, Christ is not present in the sacrament adored by him; and if Christ is not present in the Tridentine sense either, then his adoration of the sacrament is a double abomination, because it is a double idolatry.

It will be said that faith can supply or ignorance can excuse in such cases. Nothing of the kind. The faith which believes Christ present in the sacrament cannot do instead of Christ who is not there. If he is not there, to believe that he is, is nothing else than an increase of stupidity. On the other hand, the ignorance in which the Catholic worshipper is of the true state of things cannot acquit him before God of idolatry, because God has not commanded him to worship anything or any one but himself; because God has not commanded him to worship an absurdity, an impossibility, against the evidence of reason and the Bible; because God has not commanded him to adore an enigma depending entirely upon the intention of a third person unknown to the worshipper. This is why the Catholic worshipper, in the case of non-intention on the part of the consecrator, will not be acquitted of double idolatry. The vulgar proverb says, "He who makes himself a sheep, will be eaten by the wolf." If Catholics, Roman or Anglican, choose to make themselves so stupid as to believe in such absurdities as transubstantiation, which depends entirely upon the intention of a priest who may be a

regular scoundrel, and if they fall into the sin of idolatry by adoring such sacrament, they must bear the consequences at God's tribunal, and will themselves be responsible to the great Judge for all the tremendous consequences of such an abominable sin.

But, notwithstanding all the points which I have controverted, the list of Tridentine absurdities is not yet exhausted. The Roman Church, to render its sacrament the more adorable, celebrates it in a language unknown to the great majority of its people, who, understanding nothing of what the priest says and does at the altar, mistake glowworms for lanterns, according to the proverb; or believe that the bread has been transubstantiated into the body of Christ by the force of the Latin incantation. Also in this the two Churches disagree:—

Article 24. "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people."

Council, Sess. 22, Canon 9. "If any one shall say that the rite of the Roman Church, whereby part of the canon and the words of consecration are uttered in a low voice is to be condemned, or that the mass ought to be celebrated only in the vernacular tongue, let him be accursed."

EIRENICON (p. 217): "He (Du Pin) allows that divine service might be performed in the vulgar tongue, where that was customary, and, according to Maclaine, excused (I suppose defended) the Latin

and Greek Churches for preserving their ancient languages, alleging that great care had been taken that everything should be understood by translations."

Here we have once again the usual refrain: discrepancy between Articles and decrees, unauthorized complacency of Du Pin, sophism of Pusey.

If the Word of God is opposed to public prayer in an unknown tongue—and the Word of God could not be more clearly opposed to it than it is—to excuse, and, worse still, to defend the use of unknown languages in the Greek and Roman Churches, is worse than fanaticism; it is the sacrilegious violation of the Bible.

Why did Paul absolutely command that prayer should be offered in the vernacular language? In order that prayer should be profitable; *ergo*, that is not profitable prayer which is made in an unknown language; *ergo*, the mass, besides being a "fable and deceit," is also a waste of time for the people to whom it is unprofitable, seeing they do not comprehend a jot of its language.

It is, then, unworthy of the intellect and the studies of Pusey to defend this aberration from truth, on pretence that, by the celebration of the mass in an unknown tongue, the two Churches preserve their ancient languages. Is the sacrament a papyrus which must be preserved in a museum in its original language? Who cares, in the nineteenth century, in what language the mass was celebrated sixteen or seventeen centuries ago? What we care for is to have the sacrament in a language which we can understand. With regard to the Roman Church, it is

true it formerly celebrated mass in Latin, but because Latin was then the vernacular language of its people. Let it be observed, that though the Roman Church probably came from the Greek, certainly from the Oriental Church, it did not celebrate its sacrament in the Greek language, because this was unknown to the majority. Instead of that, it adopted the Latin, because it was the proper and common language of its people. This argument alone should suffice for the condemnation of the use of the Latin language, at the present day, in the celebration of the sacrament. It is no longer the proper and common language of the people.

The argument against both Churches grows more important as we reflect that Christ instituted the sacrament, not with the Greek nor with the Latin language, but with his own, as spoken in Palestine by the Jews of his time. If, then, people wish to keep to antiquity, why do not the two Churches, instead of using Greek or Latin, adopt the Syro-Chaldean language, in which the words of consecration were pronounced by our Lord Jesus Christ? Because it is a language unknown to the two Churches; *ergo*, it is equally unlawful to celebrate the sacrament in Latin now, it being a language unknown to the great majority of the people. In order to preserve the Latin language in the Church, it is not necessary to insist upon its use in public prayer. Use it to your hearts' content in bulls, briefs, canons, pastorals, &c., but do not profane the sacrament with it, in open violation of the Divine Word.

No one, I trust, will consider these observations in-

appropriate or foreign to my subject. I consider them necessary, both to show still more clearly the discrepancy between the two Churches relative to the Eucharistic sacrament, and to point out the tendency of the Puseyitic sect, which is beginning to introduce the Prayer Book translated into Latin, in order, subsequently, to secure its acceptance in the celebration of the sacrament. I would further observe, that the more fanatic of these Ultramontanists, among other tomfooleries copied from Rome, are beginning to mumble part of the communion service between their teeth, so as not to be heard by the congregation. This is the introduction of a portion of the absurdity which, in the celebration of mass, the Roman Church calls by the name of *secrete*.

With perfect reason this may be called an absurdity. The Church has decreed that, with the omission of a single word in the consecration, a single word less than was pronounced by Christ at the last Supper, with that single word less, or wrong, or altered, there is no transubstantiation at all.

Every one, then, who has sense, must at once see the necessity that the words should be pronounced aloud and in the vernacular, in order that the people may be sure that they are pronounced in their integrity, and, at the same time, sure (supposing such to be the intention of the priest) that consecration has taken place. I repeat it, even if it were the intention of the priest to consecrate, if the words were not each and all distinctly pronounced, there would be no consecration; *ergo*, it is absurd to oblige the priest to pronounce them in secret.

I conclude this point of the discrepancy between the two Churches, with regard to the Eucharistic sacrament, by producing the fifth head of the 22nd Session of the Tridentine Council. Here true Churchmen have before their eyes the origin of the masquerade and pantomime with which the ritualists of the present day profane not a few Churches of their communion. Not that this head is in disaccord with some Articles, for the Articles treat only of dogma and substantial subjects in the Anglican Confession ; yet the reader will find this head in perfect disagreement with the rubrics and statutes which were published in 1571, as laws obligatory upon the clergy ; against which laws the ritualistic maniacs of the present day rebel, in order to amuse England with the bacchanalia of Rome :—

“The nature of men being such that they cannot easily rise to meditation upon divine things without the help of exterior adminicles, pious Mother Church has instituted certain rites ; that is, that some things should be pronounced in the mass in a low voice and others aloud. She has added further ceremonies, as benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, and many other things of a similar nature, in accordance with apostolic tradition and discipline ; by means of which things the majesty of such sacrifice might be better appreciated, and the minds of the faithful, by means of these visible signs of piety and religion, might be helped in the contemplation of the lofty things which are hidden in this sacrifice.”

A document this in which it is difficult for the reader to decide whether the ignorance, the deception,

the impudence, or the audacity of its compilers is most striking !

The Church of Rome holds, indeed, the grace of Christ in light esteem on the one side, and the minds of Papists in no esteem at all on the other, when it affirms that they cannot rise to the meditation of divine things without the help of exterior charlatanism.

The Roman Church speaks falsely when it declares that its latriac charlatanism of lights, vestments, incense, and various other Pagan objects, are derived in continued succession from apostolic discipline and tradition.

The Roman Church is truly mistaken if it believes that it is a pious mother when, the better to excite its children to heavenly things, it utters before them the mystery of such things in a low voice, so that they cannot and are not expected to hear and understand them ; this being a new method of imparting to any one intelligence respecting an unknown thing. It treats them, too, as stepchildren and bastards, when it commands its priests to change from a soft to a loud voice, this being no other than the exercise of asses, especially in May.

The Roman Church utters the most abominable rubbish when it tries to make believe that by its ceremonialism, and its display of theatrical vestments and parade of lights and incense, it increases the majesty of the sacrament, which is abhorrent of all majesty not proper to it. It is true, however, that the gorgeous *mise en scène* of its mass contributes vastly to

the gratification of the senses, pleases the profane and material hearts which pay to witness it exactly as they pay to witness a representation in a theatre, and gives to its sacrifice all the majesty of the ancient Pagan sacrifices, of which it is but a copy and imitation.

The Anglican Ritualists may, therefore, be congratulated that, having discovered in this Tridentine decree the authority for their ornaments, their decorations, their candles, their incense, their Eucharistic vestments, they may henceforward be admitted to the Olympian banquet of the Mother of Harlots, who presides at its sacrifice in the luxurious mantle and with the intoxicating cup of prostitution, *sic itur ad astra*.

Corollary.—The English Church, in its Articles, not having transubstantiation, nor material presence, nor sacrifice, nor communion in one kind only, nor adoration, differs essentially from the Tridentine decrees of the Church of Rome; *ergo*, Articles and decrees do not harmonize; *ergo*, it is sophism to pretend to make them harmonize; *ergo*, the union of the two Churches is inadmissible; *ergo*, the EIRENICON is a true fallacy.

(*d.*) *Doctrine* is the last point of disagreement between Articles and decrees; and, on this point, it is more than ever demonstrable that the Anglican Confession was levelled against the Tridentine Confession.

I begin by quoting the 22nd Article as one which, at a single blow, sweeps away a good part of the Tridentine rubbish from Christian dogma:—

“ The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.”

In this Article alone we have the complete negation of purgatory, indulgences, and saintolatry. Let us proceed with order, and begin to prove the discord between the two Churches from

1. *Purgatory.*

Tridentine Council, Sess. 25, 1. “ Since the Catholic Church, taught by the Holy Spirit from the sacred writings, and ancient tradition of the Fathers in sacred councils, and last of all in this œcumenical Synod, hath taught that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but most powerfully by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar ; the holy Synod directs all bishops to take diligent heed, that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory, handed down by Holy Fathers and sacred councils, be believed by the faithful of Christ, and be everywhere taught and preached.”

This decree is a solemn lie from beginning to end, worthy only of such a council.

It is a lie that purgatory was taught to the Catholic Church by the Holy Spirit, when everything relating to purgatory is contrary to the nature of God and his revelation.

It is a lie that purgatory is taught to the Catholic

Church by the sacred Scriptures, when there is not a single word relating to purgatory throughout the whole Bible.

It is a lie that purgatory was taught to the Catholic Church by the ancient tradition of the Fathers, when a great number of the Fathers and of the councils made no mention whatever of purgatory, and a good part of them were totally opposed to every doctrine of purgatory.

Ergo, the English Article is accurately precise when it condemns Romish purgatory as "a fond thing vainly invented . . . repugnant to the Word of God."

Hence it is useless for Dr. Pusey to attempt to reconcile elements so discordant. The Church which does not admit purgatory in anywise, cannot unite with a Church which has purgatory *de fide*, as a dogma to be believed *de necessitate medii*. With regard to so pernicious a doctrine, there must be no indulgence in ascetic sentimentalism. What we know from the Bible is, that there is no purgatory of any kind; neither the minimum nor maximum of purgatory. The Bible teaches that, in the world to come, there are but two modes of existence—glory and condemnation. The Bible assures us that the sinner who is converted to God passes, *ipso facto*, from death to life, without mental restriction or reserve on God's part. The Bible, finally, declares that as the tree falls so it lies. Thus the Bible infallibly rejects every kind of purgatory, which would be an intermediate state repugnant to the nature and the revelation of God.

It is, therefore, unnecessary for Pusey to invent a

new mode of existence for the soul in the eternal world, as he does in his book (p. 191), where, instead of the Tridentine purgatory, he seeks to substitute an Oxonian purgatory, which much resembles the *Æniad* of Virgil, or the *Divina Commedia* of Dante. I cannot imagine a theological writer inventing a more puerile fiction than this Puseyitic fable: "That a number of souls seem to be fit neither for heaven nor hell, and that purgatory seems to meet the case of this class of souls" (p. 192). You mistake, Dr. Pusey, if you think we are pagan or romantic enough to accept such folly, though it is a common saying, "Can purgatory render the soul worthy in time to enter Paradise?" If the pardon of Christ, and the blood of Christ, and the sacrifice of Christ, and the merits of Christ, do not suffice to render the soul capable of enjoying Paradise on the death of the body, do you attribute this more than divine virtue to the dungeon of purgatory? I neither can nor will believe it of you. This is one of the most infamous blasphemies of the Roman Church against the infinite value of the atonement of Christ, and easily enough resolves itself into the accursed blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, never to be pardoned by God.

In the same manner, I exclude *in toto* the ascetic theory of remorse with which even the soul of the just will be tormented in the life to come, at its appearance before Christ—remorse which, according to Pusey, may be the maximum of purgatory allowed by the English Church as the counterpart of the minimum of Tridentine purgatory, to facilitate the

reunion of the two Churches (p. 192). No purgatory ! This is my motto. Either the soul leaves the world impenitent, and then the remorse which follows it to the tribunal of God will be the greatest torment in its damnation ; or the soul leaves the world penitent, and, being consequently pardoned and its sins being fully cancelled by the blood of Christ, it can experience in the second life neither remorse nor pain of any kind. No purgatory, then !

I do not here raise the question of the soul's recompense in the other world ; but I absolutely deny every species of purgation for the soul of the just. If men delay their repentance, and are negligent of good works, they will enjoy so much less reward in the gratuitous goodness of God the rewarder. This is true, because biblical ; but it does not involve either the imprisonment of the Tridentine purgatory, nor the remorse of the Puseyite purgatory.

In the same way, even supposing the fire is not matter of faith in the Papist purgatory, the Tridentine imprisonment is sufficient to render it repugnant to the holy Scriptures, and hence irreconcilable with the Article of the English Church.

I would, however, put Dr. Pusey on his guard against confiding too much in the silence of the Council of Trent with regard to the fire of purgatory. The Tridentine Fathers too well knew that such was the doctrine of the Roman Church in their time. They knew that upon the strength of that doctrine Leo X. had sold indulgences in profusion, and that the principal auctioneer in these simoniacal transactions, the famous Dominican scoundrel Tetzels,

had brought enormous sums to the Vatican by virtue of that doctrine alone. What more? The Tridentine Fathers had for their guide Thomas Aquinas, who openly declares for the fire of purgatory in no way dissimilar from that of hell. If the Fathers did not wish for such a fire as the future doctrine of their Church, why not exclude it from their decree? Having laid down their laws to the bishops to exclude all curiosity and superstition from purgatory, why did they not, at the same time, command them to exclude the doctrine of fire from the said purgatory, if reckoned by them as error or abuse? Because they wished the doctrine to remain; and not being able to declare it dogmatically, in opposition to the Greek Church, they left it at the point of dogma at which it was found at the Council of Florence. Let there be a purgatory, and there will be a fire.

What is the practice of the Church now with regard to this fire? It is such that, although in a theological discussion it can assert that it is not an article *de fide*, yet it condemns those as audacious, rebellious, and heretical who deny it. Let Pusey read any Papist book on purgatory, written by any moderate author, and which has no resemblance with the Jesuitical insanity of Rosignoli's voluminous work, "*Delle meraviglie di Dio nelle anime Purganti*;" let Pusey listen to any Papist preacher upon purgatory—I speak of things with which I am personally familiar—and if he finds no mention of fire, he may be allowed to conclude that it is not a necessary doctrine of Roman Catholicism. But as the fire is everything in purgatory, the silence of the Council of

Trent is a mere artifice to retain the thing without assuming the responsibility of it. Pusey cannot be ignorant of the common saying, "that the fire of hell is no profit to the Roman priests, but the fire of purgatory is." Souls cannot be liberated from hell, but they may be liberated from purgatory by well-paid masses, which gives a special virtue to the nature of the fire of purgatory—a virtue which keeps the priestly pot incessantly boiling with the most exquisite viands. This is why there must be fire in purgatory, and this is why the Anglican Article justly stigmatizes it as a vain invention.

With regard to indulgences, I shall quote the Tridentine decree, but I shall give but a few words only. Seeing that the English Church rejects them *in toto*, Dr. Pusey will not succeed in persuading it to admit them *in partibus*.

2. Indulgences.

Tridentine Council, Sess. 25, Ultima 1. "Since the power of bestowing indulgences has been granted by Christ to the Church, and this power, divinely given to her, she has used even from the oldest times, the most holy Synod teaches and directs that the use of indulgences, which is most salutary to Christian people and approved by the authority of sacred councils, is to be retained in the Church, and condemns by anathema those who either assert them to be useless, or deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them."

Before refusing Pusey any concession whatever upon the point of indulgences, and their admissibleness

into the English Church, I wish to notice in this decree the diabolical cunning of the Tridentine Council, which frames it wholly under false pretences. It is false that Christ gave the power of indulgences to the Church; it is false that this power was divinely conferred upon the Church; it is false that the Church has exercised it from the most remote times; it is false that the use of indulgences is salutary to Christian people; it is false that the use of indulgences has been approved by sacred councils, if by sacred councils are to be understood the first six œcumenic councils, and if by indulgences are meant the pardons of the Roman Church. *Ergo*, the Tridentine decree is a mass of falsity, and nothing but fallacy could desire that the Articles of the Church of England should harmonize with such impudent falsehood.

Indulgences in the Church are exclusively canonical, and not dogmatic in their origin. In post-apostolic times, the Church had laid its hand with exaggerated weight upon public sinners, and, in spite of every dictate of the Gospel, had excluded them from fraternal communion and participation in the mysteries, for the rest of their lives. As an antidote or compensation for its unchristian severity, it introduced indulgences. It was, then, the abuse of power which originated the abuse of indulgences. If, instead of approving the rigour of Montanus, the Church had imitated its Divine Founder, who sought the wandering sheep and brought them back to the fold, it would not have needed to launch forth its terrors, worthy to be the forerunners of the Papal inquisition, nor thus given

a reason to its best sons to seek a remedy for them in protest.

At first, indulgences were nothing more than the abbreviation or the nullification of canonic penalties, inflicted by the Church upon public sinners, and that through the interposition of the Christian confessors who were groaning in dungeons or on their way for martyrdom. The demand made by such to the Church in favour of the condemned was called the Book of the Martyrs, and the relaxation of their punishment was called the indulgence of the Church.

The Popes soon possessed themselves effectually of this power—although a long series of them were rather the deniers than the confessors of Christ—and applied the privilege no longer to do away with the canonical penalties of the Church, but to cancel sins, and to diminish and even totally annul the temporal punishments inherent to sin. To put the crowning point to her sacrilegious impiety, the Roman Church declared that indulgences were salutary even to the dead, and applicable to souls tormented in purgatory to liberate them the sooner from their imprisonment.

Hence Pusey may be well persuaded that the question between the two Churches is not simply the abuse of indulgences, or, as he supposes, their sale only (p. 204); but indulgences in themselves, which the English Church justly rejects as “repugnant to the Word of God.” I do not know how far the English Church “wishes to go back to the ancient system” (p. 204) of canonical penitence; indeed, I hope that it has no such desire, for it would certainly

not be the best means of gaining proselytes to the Church from love to Christ. All that I know from its Article is, that it knows nothing about indulgences old or new, whether dogmatic or canonic; and that because every species of ecclesiastical indulgence is repugnant to the Word of God.

Where is it in the Bible that indulgences absolve from sin? Where is it in the Bible that the sin absolved by God leaves behind it a temporal penalty to be settled in this world or the next? Where is it in the Bible that indulgences pay this penalty? Where is it in the Bible that indulgences can be applied even to the dead, and take the place of the penalty due to them of purgatory? *Ergo*, indulgences of every sort are repugnant to the Word of God, but more especially the indulgences of the Roman Church; *ergo*, the indulgences of the Roman Church are inadmissible in the English Church; *ergo*, the reunion of the two Churches is a fallacy.

One last word upon this lie of indulgences, in order to prove its Tridentine impiety. It is sought to establish the doctrine of indulgences upon the basis of the inexhaustible treasure of the merits of Christ, of Mary, and of the saints. But what have Mary and the saints to do with Christ? If the infinite merits of Christ do not suffice to constitute the treasure of indulgences, what can the finite and limited merits of Mary and the saints do in addition? If the merits of Christ, infinite as they are, suffice to form this treasure of indulgences, what is the good of adding the useless dose of the finite and limited merits of Mary and the saints? Here we see the usual sacri-

legious irreverence, the usual impious want of confidence with regard to the divine Saviour, and this for the purpose of increasingly introducing and recommending to Papists—

3. *Saintolatry.*

Tridentine Council, Sess. 25, 2. "The holy Synod commands all bishops, and others who bear the office and charge of teaching, that according to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, the consent of the holy Fathers, and the decrees of sacred councils, they diligently instruct the faithful, in the first place, concerning the intercession and invocation of saints, the honour due to reliques, and the lawful use of images; teaching them that the saints, reigning together with Christ, offer their prayers, aid, and assistance, for the procuring of benefits from God through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour; but that they deny that the saints, enjoying eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked, or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of them, in order to their praying for each of us, is idolatry; or that it is contrary to the Word of God, and opposed to the honour of the one Mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ, or that it is foolish to supplicate them reigning in heaven with voice or mind: think impiously.

"Also, that the holy body of holy martyrs, and of others living with Christ, which were lively members of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Spirit, to be

raised by him to eternal life and glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, since by their means many benefits are bestowed by God on man; so that they who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the reliques of saints; or that these and other sacred memorials are honoured without advantage by the faithful, and that commemoration of the saints are in vain celebrated for the sake of beseeching their aid, are altogether to be condemned, even as the Church has of old condemned, and does now condemn them.

“Moreover, images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and that due honour and veneration is to be shown to them . . . If any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be accursed.”

The Tridentine decree embraces three points: invocation, relics, and images. With regard to all three, it is in open opposition to Article 22, consequently inadmissible under any pretence or cavil whatever for the reunion of the two Churches.

I make the general observation here, that the Tridentine Fathers, in this idolatrous decree, were unable to quote the authority of the Bible in their favour, and therefore confined themselves to declaring that their doctrine was that of the primitive Church. But this is proved false by patristic doctrine itself, which is opposed to the worship of saints, and is also proved false, even according to the Council of Trent, which could cite no council in favour of images anterior to the second Nicene. This proves that, in order to

declare this abomination of idolatry dogmatic, the Tridentine Fathers had no other authority but that of men and falsehood.

Invocation.—This in itself is worship; all worship of the creature is idolatry; *ergo*, the invocation of saints is idolatry.

I will prove the major of the syllogism; that is, that invocation, in itself, is worship. The highest grade of adoration; the culminating point of any worship whatever, is the act of asking the protection and the favour of the object adored; invocation asks protection and favour; *ergo*, invocation is the ultimate and superlative grade of worship. Nor is this my own sentiment or a mere exaggeration. With Pusey (p. 109), I can quote in favour of my proposition the authority of the great Ultramontane controversialist, Cardinal Bellarmine, who calls invocation, *eximium adorationis genus*; *ergo*, invocation is in itself worship.

I will prove the minor of the syllogism; that is, that all worship of the creature is idolatry. The honour and veneration which are not given directly to God constitute idolatry, *per se*; the worship of the saints is honour and veneration, which are not given directly to God; *ergo*, the worship of saints is idolatry. It is useless to declare, in opposition to my argument, that the worship which the Roman Church decrees to the creature is inferior to the worship which she reserves for God alone. The latter she calls *latria*, the worship of the Virgin Mary she calls *iperdulia*, and that of the saints *dulia*. But as the Bible makes no mention of such gradations of worship,

and as the Bible condemns all worship without distinction paid to the creature, under whatever name, therefore the worship of saints is scripturally idolatry.

It is objected, further, that the worship paid to the saints does not terminate in them, but terminates ultimately in God alone. Even if this were the case practically, yet the worship of saints would always partake of the nature of idolatry. None but God has a right to be adored, and God ought not to be adored through the medium of any substitute. But practically it is quite otherwise, and I am glad to see that Pusey recognises it, stigmatises it, and assures his readers that, without some great revolution, such devotions (impious and idolatrous) can never "gain hold of the hearts of the English people" (p. 111). This is, however, what is actually the case in the Roman Church. Among all and everywhere, worship is paid to saints, and confidence is fully reposed in the saint who is invoked, in preference to any other being whatever; *ergo*, the worship of saints is idolatry.

I pray Dr. Pusey not to seek in any way to extenuate the guilt of the Roman Church in this invocation, and to remain firm in the mediation of Christ the Redeemer, which he explicitly advocates, and for which I offer him a hearty "God bless you!" Invocation implies not merely asking the saints for their prayers, but soliciting their intercession, their mediation, their favour, their patronage in everything. For me it would be too much to ask them to *orate pro nobis*, as tending towards idolatry is the act in itself; and for me it would also be a stupidity to ask for the

prayers of persons who I am not sure are in God, and who even if in God, I do not know can hear, and see, and compassionate and help me. Christ, who can compassionate and help us, sees and hears us; then we have no need of the *ora pro nobis* of any saint.

But when the Papist doctrine of invocation assumes the character of intercession, it then becomes, *ipso facto*, abominable idolatry and sacrilege against the mediation of Christ, and has the nature of the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, in that it robs the Redeemer of his exclusive attribute as the only mediator. Pusey well knows that intercession not only enters into the practical system of the Papist multitude, but forms a part, doctrinally and dogmatically, of the Roman Church. In addition to the passages which Pusey himself learnedly cites in proof of my thesis (p. 109), he may take, with regard to Mary, the breviary's antiphony attributed to Augustine: *INTERCEDE pro devoto femineo sexu*; the response in the office of the Immaculate Conception—*INTERCEDE pro nobis apud Patrem cujus Filium peperisti*; and, with regard to saints, the close of the Major Litany—which the Roman Church uses on the most solemn occasions—*Omnes Sancti et Sanctæ Dei INTERCEDITE pro nobis*. What more? Does not the Tridentine decree itself speak *de sanctorum INTERCESSIONE et invocatione*? And did not the above Council place the seal upon all its blasphemies when, by the *fiat fiat, amen amen* of its members, it exclaimed, *INTERCEDENTE simul inviolatâ Dominâ nostrâ sanctâ Deiparâ et omnibus Sanctis*? Here is intercession, not only in the practical system of the

ignorant and fanatic, but in the doctrine and dogma of the Church itself. The intercession of the creature with God, or even with Christ, is derogatory to the perpetual intercession which Christ makes for us, and which he desires and ought to make alone; *ergo*, the invocation of saints is abominable idolatry.

Relics.—With regard to relics, the Roman Church has degenerated below the idolatry of the Pagans themselves. These might form gods even of animals and reptiles, useful or hurtful to them, from gratitude or fear; but they never descended so low as to venerate mummies, bones, skins, ashes, rags, and even the filth and putridity of their heroes, as the Papists do with the relics of their saints. Now, let the reader observe, that it is not merely a question here of that honour which every civilized nation, and every gentle, refined heart pays to the departed, and to the great men of all countries, whose sepulchres are everywhere environed with respect and admiration. When we speak of the relics of saints, we speak of everything belonging to them, even the most ridiculous and the most repulsive; the spectacles of S. Philip Neri, the filthy swaddling band of the Blessed Bianchi, and other similar fooleries and indecencies.

Nor is it simply honour that is demanded for such relics but veneration, which is true worship, and therefore idolatry. And veneration is demanded in order to obtain benefits and miracles through their instrumentality, which is, in reality, the height of idolatry. To such a degree of veneration do these relics rise among Papists, that even Christ in the Sacrament is as nothing compared with them. To

confine myself to Italy alone, I may mention the honours and the reverence paid to the imposture of the supposed house of Nazareth, at Loreto; the honour and reverence paid to the body of St. Anthony, in the city of Padua; the honour and reverence paid to the apocryphal relics of St. Peter in the Vatican at Rome; and these are sufficient to show that this honour and veneration are a true worship, and therefore idolatry. While the sacramental altar at Rome—on which Papists believe that Christ is present alive, body, blood, soul, and divinity—counts but seven lamps, the apocryphal relics of St. Peter have a hundred and fifty cornucopias burning night and day to illumine their apocryphalness. And so it is throughout the rest of the Papist world; *ergo*, idolatrous worship.

The idolatry passes all bounds when we reflect that recourse is had to these relics for every sort of grace, favour, and miracle, both spiritual and temporal. In order that Pusey may not think that idolatry is connected only with the stupidity of the masses, I would beg him to reflect that it is the Church herself which teaches and favours it. She exposes the relics of saints, and offers them to be kissed by Catholics; and while she crosses them with the relics, she pronounces over them the Satanic conjuration, *per intercessionem*. Thus, by way of example, when any one has recourse to Saint Biagio to be cured of sore throat (a notice which I commend to all Ritualists, in case they should be thus afflicted in consequence of the Gregorian chant, introduced by them into the English service), the priest, while offering a small

piece of bone of the above saint to be kissed, pronounces the formula of the Church over the patient—*PER INTERCESSIONEM Beati Blasii pontificis et martyris liberet te Deus ab omni malo gutturis, Amen.* Here, then, is intercession coupled with relics. Intercession is idolatry—*ergo*, the worship of relics idolatrous. I can admit of no cavilling upon the question. The veneration which is paid to relics is of the self-same nature as the worship which is paid to the Madonna and saints—*ergo*, it is true worship, and, if worship, *ergo* idolatry.

Images.—Apply the above to images, and you will have, in the honour and reverence decreed to them by the Council, the characteristics of worship and idolatry which are “repugnant to the Word of God.” And here, again, I ask Dr. Pusey to avail himself of the acuteness and accuracy of his own views, and not suffer himself to be imposed upon by the theoretic charlatanism of the Tridentine Council and Papistic theologians. With all their empty talk, to the effect that images serve only as aids to faith and for the promotion of piety, and have no real worship paid to them, universal practice proves directly the contrary. God is lost sight of in consequence of the images; in almost all cases true worship is paid to the images, and worship is confined to them, without the least thought of God. Now that I have the Bible for my lamp and Christ for my all, I can but pity those who think they cannot raise their thoughts to God without the material help of an image. Ah! what punishment for a soul who has need of the work of a man’s hand to know and love God. Nature and revelation

are closed to his ossified faith. He who cannot ascend to God by faith will certainly never reach him by the ladder of images, which extends no farther than his eyes can see. Images and materiality are the same thing, and therefore images are an abomination in the sight of God.

That worship stops at the images, and scarcely ever rises to God, is proved by the practice both of the Church and the people. I say of the Church. What do the honours paid by the Church to individual images signify but the special worship of such images? For example, when the Pope crowns an image, or causes it to be crowned by his Vatican chapter, what is this distinction but honour to the image, as such, rather than to the original, which it represents? I might cite facts without number to prove that Church and clergy have no other object than to procure customers for the images as images. To take one example. Near Pistoia, a priest keeps two images of the Madonna covered up. To uncover one of them he demands a shilling, and to display the other he demands five shillings. If the original of both images is the same Madonna, why this difference of price? On account of the difference of the popularity of the two images—*ergo*, worship paid to the image, and which ends in the image.

The people, too, by their practice, prove this abominable idolatry. Although there may be many images of the Madonna or of a saint in a city—indeed, there is frequently a plurality of images of the same original in one church—yet the devotees prefer one to all the rest, pray exclusively before that one, and often

consider the others of no value whatever—*ergo*, image worship, and therefore idolatry.

I would entreat of Pusey on no account to encourage the introduction of images into the Anglican Church, since their worship would most assuredly be the result. Human nature cannot change its character in this island, and history stands ready to assure us that, if once introduced, under any pretence whatever, they will finish by being venerated. This is what took place after the second Nicene Council, which permitted them as the painted history of the martyrs, for the benefit of those who could not read. After a few generations history gave place to idolatry, the images were venerated and invoked for intercession. And so it would befall with the English Church, if the use of images were encouraged under pretence that they are helps to piety. He who is so poor in faith as to have need of an image to be a believer and a Christian, will end by becoming the material worshipper of the image—an idol which he is able to understand, because adapted to his utter want of sense and Christian spirituality.

Principiis obsta. This is the time for a fresh crusade against the contraband traffic in images, which, in imitation of Rome, treacherous Tractarianism is seeking to introduce among Churchmen in opposition to the Article, which absolutely prohibits it. When I observe the mania so general at the present day for memorial windows and stained glasses, statues, and figures of Madonnas, angels, and saints, I tell my audience, and inscribe on these pages, that idolatry has already begun to introduce itself into the English

Church in accordance with the well-known proverb, *cosa fatta capo ha*. Images have already begun to be held in honour by the Ritualists; they have already begun to be venerated and invoked for aid. Who, then, can, hereafter, prevent them from having their own public worship, resulting in national idolatry? When, years ago, I was so severe against the introduction of the cross, even under the pretence of simple ornament, it was in consequence of my experience with regard to men and things relating to the Papal system. That I was a prophet may now be seen. The cross has become fashionable; the fashion of the simple cross has produced the fashion of the cross with the five wounds, or their symbols; the fashion of the figured cross has produced the fashion of the crucifix, and this complex necromancy has produced the fashion of the apostasy of numbers of deceived, thoughtless individuals, who have been drawn away by the image to the idolatry of Rome.

Poor cross! thou hast indeed sunk low, thanks to fashion and to the enthusiasm of thy new worshippers! From the souvenir of Golgotha thou hast passed into the saloons of revelling and dancing; thou hast appeared upon the stage to adorn the breasts of actors and ballet-dancers; thou hast been dragged into the abode of sin to adorn the daughters of vice and prostitution with an appearance of piety; thou hast been embroidered on the stoles and capes of ritualists for the Eucharistic service, and upon the frontlets of horses to figure religiously in Hyde Park or at Epsom Races. To exhibit thee wherever fashion and the enthusiasm of ultramontane adorers can reach, they have

impressed thee upon the envelopes of letters, that thou mayest seal with their saliva the assassinations of anonymous scurrility, or the message of their illicit amours, or the yet more illicit myteries of their confessionals !

I will conclude this brief examination of saintolatry by declaring to Pusey, who hopes that in the reunion it will not overflow England (p. 111), that he has no historical antecedents to guarantee his hope. Let the learned Doctor remember the old saying of Gregory the Great, that it is well to split the serpent's head as soon as it shows itself at the hole of the house door, if you will prevent it from entering the house. Where the serpent has once introduced its head, it will soon introduce its whole body. In the same way, those who do not wish for the worship of saints, ought not to permit images ; since where the images are to-day, their worship will enter to-morrow ; the entire worship of saints will follow, which is idolatry in the sight of God, and justly anathematized in the 22nd Article of the Anglican Confession.

A last comparison between Articles and decrees will show still more clearly the inadmissibleness, and hence the fallacy of the reunion. The examination turns upon the celibacy of the clergy in the Roman Church, and the matrimony of the clergy in the English Church, a subject of the highest importance, not only as a point of doctrine, but also as a point on which the virtue of the clergy and the morality of the laity depend.

Article 32. " Bishops, priests, and deacons are not

commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."

Council of Trent, Sess. 24, Canon 9. "If any one shall say that clergymen in holy orders, or that regulars having solemnly professed chastity, may contract marriage, and that, being contracted, it is valid, notwithstanding the law of the Church, or the vow; and that the contrary is nothing else than to condemn marriage; and that all have the power of contracting marriage, who do not think that they have the gift of chastity, even if they vowed it, let him be accursed.

Canon 10. "If any one shall say that the marriage state is to be preferred to that of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and happier to remain in virginity or celibacy than to be joined in marriage, let him be accursed."

Can the discrepancy be more absolute and patent? In the English Church, the Article promotes the observance of God's command, the godliness of the clergy, the holiness of matrimony, and the edification of the community. The Tridentine decree, on the contrary, proclaims with anathema the triumph of Satan, and with the hypocrisy of the serpent in Eden deceives souls to their ruin; so that the whole Tridentine decree is nothing less than infamous wickedness. That it justly merits this appellation I will prove.

It is infamous that a supposed counsel of Christ should take the place of the commandment of God,

obeyed by all living creation. It is infamous that the Church should substitute her own laws for a divine institution, and the whole legislation of the New Testament. It is infamous to refuse to those who have not the gift of chastity the salutary remedy of matrimony, and to declare, with Bellarmine, in opposition to the Apostle Paul, that it is better to burn than to marry. It is infamous to exalt the caprice and supererogation of celibacy above the state of matrimony commanded by God and sanctified by Christ; more especially in the Roman Church, which, after exalting matrimony to a sacrament, prefers to it the unhallowed egotism of celibacy. It is infamous to canonize the immorality of the clergy by declaring celibacy to be a state of life better and happier than matrimony; thus involving at the same time the condemnation of matrimony itself and the triumph of license.

It is particularly to the last point that these brief observations are directed. The system of obligatory celibacy can only result, as a rule, in the license of the clergy, and hence in the disgrace and immorality of the Church. Let no one accuse me of exaggeration when I declare solemnly that, among the celibate clergy, morality is the microscopic exception to the general rule. License and scandal are universal. I shall not send those who are incredulous with regard to my assertion to the new world, to see with their own eyes the public triumph of clerical immorality in all the old colonies of Spain and Portugal, where, with the advantages of a clergy generally ignorant, fanatic, brutal and intolerant, the people are edified

by the spectacle of unlimited concubinage and bastardy on the part of its clergy, who, however, by way of amends, have been the most frantic in celebrating the dogma of the immaculate conception of Mary.

I would rather direct the incredulous to Rome, where the Romans are accustomed to call those monks and priests who, according to appearances, are faithful to their celibacy, saints; but truly their number is so small that it would not be difficult often to count them upon the fingers of one hand. When I was confined, under Gregory XVI., at San Severino, and prevented preaching on account of some liberal sermons which I had given, a Roman colonel in the Pontifical army, who was initiated into all the mysteries of Rome, sent me a list of the concubines who ruled in Rome, beginning with the Pope's own. In that list, which included all the first prelates of the Curia and the Roman court, the only one who did not figure with his mistress was Cardinal Lambruschini. I disdained to avail myself of so infamous a channel to procure my liberation, and preferred to remain in seclusion eighteen months, until the death of the Pope, who had, as companions in St. Peter's chair, Venus and Bacchus.

That the natural effect of celibacy, systematic and obligatory, is the dissoluteness and immorality of the clergy, is proved by the canons of all the councils of the Roman Church after the introduction of this infamous doctrine—canons which are not to be found in anterior councils. License, then, is consequent upon the infamous doctrine. The Tridentine Council

itself testifies against the system of celibacy when it is obliged to deplore the scandal of the concubinage of the clergy, and of the children born of these illegitimate unions.* But the evil will always exist, although its name may be changed, so long as the wicked doctrine of celibacy is persisted in.

It should never be lost sight of, that the true and ultimate object for which the celibacy of the clergy was ordained, was to withdraw them from the family, and make them into a compact army, devoted to the interests of its own caste, and which should prefer the Church to society, to eternal salvation, and to Christ himself. It may be, in a certain sense and within certain limits, that the married clergy are, in particular cases, distracted from assiduous and zealous attention to their pastoral ministry by their anxieties respecting wife and children, especially if their incomes are beneath the primary wants of life; but if the comfort, the quiet, the order, the morality, and the affection found in the state of matrimony and at the family fireside, be taken into account, no sensible person can fail to give the preference, for utility and edification, to a married clergy. I will sum up the praises of voluntary matrimony with the single reflection, that the clergy who are obliged to remain single, if not faithful to their vows, can be neither useful nor zealous. While living habitually in sin, they can neither feel zeal for the salvation of souls and the glory of God, nor can they impart to their ministrations that serenity and gentleness which are necessary to win the multitude to heavenly things.

* Sess. xxv. caps. 14, 15.

Let England take heed to what I now write, for it will have much to do with the future destiny of the nation. That the clergy should be kept single on system is against every right sentiment. It is a clergy which lives by robbery and rapine, to the detriment of moral society. The infamous aim of such celibacy is to enjoy the delights of matrimony without its responsibilities, duties, burdens, and thorns. The result is shown in the dishonour of the marital bed, or in the foundling hospitals which clerical celibacy fills on the Continent. This is so true, that in some parts of Italy, Switzerland, and Germany the people would formerly only accept for parish priests those who were accompanied by their mistresses, in order to preserve their own women from the libertinage of unmarried pastors. Truly it is an infamous doctrine!

On this account, I am frightened when I read, at the present day, advertisements in all the Tractarian journals for young curates, with regard to whom the first condition is that they shall be unmarried. Who will answer for their chastity? Will these ultramontane celibates in England form an exception to the general rule of immorality exhibited by the unmarried clergy, both in the old world and the new? England will find it out, but at too serious a cost. This I will here solemnly assert, that the mania of the Tractarian clergy for introducing confessionals into the English Church, and the enthusiasm of women for frequenting them, will reveal to England what is no longer a mystery on the Continent—that the celibacy of the clergy finds no market more plen-

tiful or more convenient to satisfy its appetites than the confessional.

For love, then, of that exemplary deportment which, in these centuries of Reformation, has been the rule among the English clergy, I pray Dr. Pusey to reflect upon the disastrous consequences in this respect which must follow, should the English Church unite with the Roman. Let Pusey give no credence to the assertion of Du Pin (p. 231), that the Roman Church might permit the matrimony of the English clergy. The actual English Church is no Church at all in the estimation of Rome, and the Articles of the Anglican Confession, which leaves the clergy free to marry, would have no value whatever in the reunion; and it would therefore be necessary to adopt the celibacy which is the universal law of Rome, more especially since the decrees of the Tridentine Council.

Before concluding this chapter on a subject which seems to me all important, I will make a final observation. It is highly necessary to give more prominence to the Articles of the Anglican Confession than has been the case hitherto. In many Prayer Books, they are not to be found at all; so that the people are acquainted with the rubrics and services, which are but the dress, and know little, and sometimes nothing whatever, about the Articles, which are the person or the substance of their Church. If the clergy, from time to time, would make the dogmatic explanation of the Articles the subject of their sermons, Ritualism would cease to profane the English Church with its new forms of Paganism, and Tractarianism would have no field in which to descant upon reunion with Rome,

from the decrees of which everybody would see that they were at the antipodes. May God preserve the dogmatic purity of its confession to the English Church, which will recognize nothing that is repugnant to the Bible!

Let us state what has been said above in a brief

SUMMARY.

The reunion of the two Churches is a fallacy, because the examination of the nature, the object, and the history of the Tridentine Council, proves that harmony between Articles and decrees is IMPOSSIBLE.

The reunion of the two Churches is a fallacy, because the examination of their doctrines proves that they are so divergent in so many points of deep importance, that harmony between Articles and decrees is INCOMPATIBLE.

The reunion of the two Churches is a fallacy, because the examination of Articles and decrees, with regard to rule of faith, to atonement, to sacraments, to doctrine, proves that harmony between Articles and decrees is INADMISSIBLE.

The object of the EIRENICON is to demand and facilitate this reunion; *ergo*, the EIRENICON is a fallacy.

CHAPTER III.

THE SNARE.

BEFORE developing the subject of this chapter, I am more than ever desirous of explaining the nature of the sentiments which have induced me to write against the EIRENICON. I would not have it thought that I am moved by animosity towards Dr. Pusey, against whom I have no animosity of any kind, nor by the pleasure of vilifying him, for it is not my intention to vilify any one personally. My whole and sole object is to combat that which I esteem error. So long as I have treated upon mere hallucination and fallacy, I was free to indulge in some strictures of criticism; for a criticized writer does not lose his personal character, although it may be proved that he labours under an hallucination. The self-love of the writer criticized may, indeed, be wounded by the pungency and sarcasm of the critic, but the character of the man suffers no injury. Here, however, in treating of *the Snare*, it is necessary that I should

explain myself, lest Pusey should take offence, or his admirers suspect that I wish to insult him.

By *snare*, I do not intend deception deliberately planned and proposed for the deliberate ruin of the credulous and simple. Such deception would constitute a man a *deceiver*; and I am too frank and honest to suppose such animus and such design on the part of Dr. Pusey, about whom, as a gentleman and a Christian, there are not two opinions in England. For my own part, I know too well how heavily the reproach of *deceiver* weighs upon an educated and sincere man to cast it gratuitously in the face of any one. I leave the dirty office entirely in the hands of men of the stamp and character of the Rev. R. W. Steward, of Leghorn, who, in journals reflecting his own nature, bestows upon me and those who, like me, desire an Italian Church in Italy, the graceful title of *deceivers*. It is true, according to our proverb, that the cask can give only such wine as it contains; therefore, from men of such education and such temperament as this Reverend Dr. Steward, the title of *deceiver* can be only a compliment. But as I do not write for the journal, *A Voice from Italy*, I shall not allow myself to treat Dr. Pusey, in consequence of his project of reunion with Rome, in the shameful manner in which I was treated by this Dr. Steward for my project of reunion between the evangelical Churches of Italy.* But let him rest in peace in his own element!

* This Rev. Dr. Steward is the patron, the organ, and the special agent of the Waldensians in Italy. May God preserve the Waldensians from imitating him in abusing those who labour in the Evangelization of Italy, otherwise Satan will surely destroy the Lord's work in our country.

Since the EIRENICON really contains a snare, it must be allowed either that Pusey himself was deceived by others in proposing his plan, or that in proposing it he was quite unconscious that it concealed a snare. And here it is well to repeat, in reference to Pusey, what he says in reference to Olier (pp. 104, 105): "To me, this seemed unintentional heresy . . . of course I never thought of imputing to a pious writer like M. Olier conscious heresy . . . The assertion itself, however . . . must, in any plain meaning of the words, be heretical." In the same way, the snare is unintentional. Of course I do not impute to a pious writer like Pusey that he consciously lays a snare, yet the reunion of the two Churches, in any plain meaning of the words, is a snare. With this renewed declaration, I proceed to the confutation of the EIRENICON.

In proposing the reunion, Dr. Pusey does his best to prove its possibility. It is precisely in this possibility, which, in his view (pp. 262—268), is most easy of accomplishment, that I find the snare unwittingly laid by him for the *bonâ-fide* Christians of the English Church. The deception lies concealed especially in four points—Church, councils, creeds, and practical system. In the first three, Pusey is positive—that is, he already sees agreement in that which exists; in the fourth he is negative—that is, he hopes for agreement from that which is not to be brought about. Let us proceed in this order.

I.

THE CHURCH.

In Oxford, they are adepts in the theological art of soaping the ways, to render them agreeably slippery to the amateurs of Papistic skating; nor are examples wanting in the EIRENICON of attempts made by the reunionists, with large doses of Catholic soap diluted with sophisms, to facilitate in every way the slippery journey to Rome. If they avoid slipping by the way, they will have a comfortably orthodox journey, and reach the palace of the Vatican Circe, who, cup in hand and cross on slipper, awaits them with enchanting smile to metamorphose them into automata. But we will avoid the way, and, having discovered its soapy sophistry, will keep clear of the snare.

Let us begin with the sophism in favour of the Church of Rome (pp. 266, 267): "The Church of England and the Council of Trent have long seemed to me at cross purposes. In some cases, at least, the Council of Trent proposed the minimum of which it would accept, but left a maximum, far beyond the letter of the Council, to be thereafter, as it was before, the practical system of the Church. The Church of England, in her Articles, protested against that maximum, the practical system which she saw around her; but in many cases she laid down no doctrine at all on the subject upon which she protested. She made negative statements to show against what she protested, but set down no positive

statement to explain what, on the same subject, she accepted."

All this is sophism. In the first place, I deny *in toto* that the Tridentine Council proposed a minimum which it might accept. That council, as I have elsewhere proved (Chap. II., 1), was assembled not to propose anything. It was assembled not to accept any condition whatever, but to decree and anathematize. Hence it is that its canons were not propositions to lead to agreement, but definitions of Roman Catholic faith to be unconditionally received, on pain of anathema. And when I say unconditionally, I express a positive fact. The Roman Church, *per se*, and much more in its council, demands blind, passive, and absolute obedience, admits of neither reasoning nor discussion, reserves to itself alone the interpretation of its council in case of any doubt arising among Catholics, and does not permit outsiders to attack or suspect its infallible authority, even in the slightest degree; *ergo*, the EIRENICON lays a snare in causing it to be believed that the Tridentine Council offers a minimum which the Church of England may accept. And here the sophism becomes worse on the side of the English Church. To suppose that the Church, in its Articles, does no more than protest against the maximum or practical system of the Roman Church, left deliberately on one side by the Tridentine Council, is to suppose an absurdity. If the Articles are only a protest, they cannot be a profession of faith; and if the English Church, in its Articles, is only negative, without any positive statement respecting its dogma, wanting in a rule of faith, and is not a Church

at all, but a weathercock which turns with every wind.

Is it possible that Dr. Pusey can see nothing positive in the Thirty-nine Articles? In what, then, has he believed up to this time? He gives us the edifying assurance that he believes what his Church believes (p. 7); but if his Church holds nothing positive, if his Church is but a negative protest, then his Church has nothing to be believed. He believes only that which his Church believes; his Church has nothing in which to believe; *ergo*, the author of the EIRENICON believes in nothing. This is the point to which the subtle syllogism of our Doctor reduces itself.

And there is something still worse. If the English Church has no "positive statement on the subject," it cannot assume any title or claim, either as the rule of faith and conscience of the people, or to judge and condemn the errors and heresies which may spring up in its midst. In fact, if it cannot say authoritatively, "this is to be believed," every one is free to believe and to teach according to his own interest or caprice. In that case, neither Episcopate nor Privy Council can prevent Jesuits, in the disguise of English clergymen, from preaching Romanism, since they cannot say to them, "What you preach is not the doctrine of the English Church." If the English Church has no doctrine peculiar to itself, each person is at liberty to make his own and preach it. A Church without rule is like a ship without rudder. The legal test, also, is wanting for judging and condemning. What tribunal could decide in matters of faith, if there was nothing positively established? There would no longer be

any Church, and rebellion and anarchy would triumph; *ergo*, it is a snare of the EIRENICON to make it appear that the English Church protested only against the maximum of the Roman Church, and that the English Church may easily be absorbed in the minimum of the Tridentine Council, on the ground that it has "set down no positive statement on the same subject."

With regard to Wiseman's statement, endorsed by Pusey, "we must explain to the utmost," I should like to know how reunion could be attained in consequence of explanations without the loss, I will not say of faith, but even of common sense. Undoubtedly it is not the Roman Church which should give explanations but the English. Indeed, from the quotation of Bossuet (p. 267, note), while they ought not to demand from the Lutherans a retractation of the Confession of Augsburg, they still ought to ask of them "an explanation of the confession in accordance with Catholic doctrines." From this it results that the Roman Church considers itself the sole depository of Catholic doctrine (Catholic not Christian), on which supposition it claims that all others should conform to it *in toto*, and compels them to prove that their doctrines are in agreement with the catholicity of its own. Such are the sole and precise terms of any possible explanation.

In the case, then, of the Puseyitic scheme, it is for the English Church humbly to prove to the Roman, that its Articles are not in opposition to the Council of Trent, but that they are rather the amplification and logical corollary of that council. Indeed, ac-

according to Wiseman,* it is necessary "that such an explanation may be given of the most difficult (of the 39) Articles as will strip them of all contradiction to the decrees of the Tridentine Synod." Let us reason against this impious proposition, which may demonstrate to Pusey better than any argument of mine, that the Roman Church believes the Articles of the Prayer Book were "levelled against the decrees of the Council of Trent." The Tridentine decrees were all directed against the Reformation; therefore, to deprive the Articles of all contradiction to those decrees, is the same thing as to deny that they belong to the Reformation. The Tridentine decrees were all directed to the confirmation of the dogmatic errors of Rome; so that to deprive the Articles of all contradiction to those decrees, is the same thing as to prove that they receive the errors of Rome for dogmas.

The Church of Rome will never accept the proposition of reunion unless this explanation is made. *Ergo*, the scheme of reunion involves the abjuration of Christianity professed by the Thirty-nine Articles, in order to come to agreement with Tridentine Catholicism. *Ergo*, the proposal of this reunion, on such conditions, on the pretence that it is possible, and indeed easy, is no other than a most pernicious snare.

Yet one more word on this point to demonstrate that the *EIRENICON*, at least, is infected with Papist virus, when it insults Reformers and the Reformation, as it has now become the fashion to do among the disciples of Ultramontaniam. In speaking of the

* Letter to Lord Shrewsbury.

Tridentine Council, Pusey assures us that it "was largely directed against errors of Luther" (p. 268), which I call a Papist insult. If Pusey allows the English Church the right of reforming itself, even in spite of Rome (p. 80), will he refuse that right to other Churches, especially that of Germany, which was the first to exercise it, thanks to the courage of Luther? Perhaps he does so because Luther was neither a king nor a bishop. But this is a trifle to be left to children, and which ought not to enter into the controversy of a serious writer. To call the doctrines of the Reformation as preached by Luther, and subsequently formulated in the Confession of Augsburg (a confession which Bossuet himself praised as full of Catholic truth), to call these doctrines "errors," is such an example of Christian logic as to make the Oxford of Pusey appear to me not very far off the scholastic scurrility of the Rome of Perrone and Manning.

Let us now proceed to the sophism in favour of the Church of Greece.

In a certain sense, the reunion with the Greek Church is even worse than with the Roman. Notwithstanding some appearance of similarity in some points with the English Church, the Greek Church, according to my opinion—and I write as I feel, after long study and contact with men and things—is worse than the Roman as to ignorance, superstition, and idolatry; while it is, at the same time, less logical than the Roman in its forms and organization. But let us take no heed of all this, but suppose the reunion desirable. In what terms?

"We have no ground to fear in regard to her, lest she should force back upon us that vast practical system, still prevalent in the Western Church, which was one occasion, and is the justification, of our isolated condition. We had nothing to do with the great schism of the East and West . . . With regard to her, too, we may have a providential office, that we, too, have received the *Filioque*, not by any act of our own, but as circulated insensibly throughout the Latin Church; and while we could not part with that, through so many centuries has been the expression of our common faith, we might still reject with anathema the heresy, which, since Photius, has been imputed to it . . . We had no share in this; we only ask to continue to use a formula, which, without any act of our own, has been the expression of our faith immemorially" (pp. 263—266).

This is the snare. The whole practical system prevalent in the Roman Church prevails more or less in the Greek Church, and, in not a few cases, in an aggravated form. Let those who have not seen how material is the religion, how brutal the fanaticism of the people in the Greek Church, hesitate ere they deny that it is even worse than the practical system of Rome. Now, if the EIRENICON has any objection to reunion with Rome, the objection is founded upon nothing but the fear that Rome should wish, in case of the reunion, to impose her practical system upon the English Church, which will have nothing to do with it. To assert, then, that there is no such fear in the reunion with the Greek Church, because the practical system has no existence there, is not only a gratuitous assertion,

but is positively, though perhaps unconsciously on the writer's part, a snare.

With regard to the assertion, "We have nothing to do with the great schism of the East and West," Dr. Pusey will permit me to tell him that this is a poor cavil, though it assumes the character of an astute sophism. When the schism between the East and West occurred, the English Church was united to the Roman; *ergo*, as forming part of the Church of the West, the English Church had to do with that schism, and absolutely partook of it. Even though the schism had been a fact posterior to the Reformation, still it would have been impossible to treat of reunion without coming to an agreement upon the reasons which led to it. But seeing that it was anterior, the Greek Church has every right to ask the English to come to a decided understanding upon the dogmatic point of the *Filioque*.

The argument of Pusey to retain it, with the mental reservation that it does not contain heresy (pp. 264-5), both proves nothing and proves too much. It proves nothing, because it is founded upon the frivolous pretext of not having taken part in the Council of Florence in imposing the *Filioque* upon the Greeks, when, in reality, it did take part. It proves too much when it seeks to retain it on the specious pretext, "We only ask to continue to use the formula which, without any act of our own, has been the expression of our faith immemorially." Then every other error of Rome anterior to the Reformation ought to be retained in the English Church *à pari*, indeed, *à fortiori*; all

such having formerly been the expression of the ancient English faith *ab immemorabili*.

But Pusey knows that "immemorially" can never constitute a thing legal which is illegal in itself. All the abuses which justly occasioned the Reformation were *ab immemorabili*; yet no one ever believed that they were consequently legitimate and ought to be accepted. What more "immemorial" fable exists in the Roman Church than the donation of Constantine? Yet who at the present day is foolish enough to accept it on the ground of its "immemorialness?" He who inherits the stolen robe will be the heir of the thief, and, therefore, *de jure*, bound to make restitution.

Pusey having learnedly proved (*ib.*) that the *Filioque* was interpolated with the Nicene Creed through ignorance and error in Spain, and thus, subsequently, adopted in France and Rome, has by this proved that the *Filioque* at the present day is found in the Prayer Book, not as an orthodox introduction, but as an apocryphal intrusion. With what assurance, then, can you say to the Greeks, while you solicit their union, Leave us this intrusive *Filioque*, which to you seems redolent of heresy, because we have had it "immemorially?" With how much more reason could the Greeks answer: If you desire so much to unite with us, give up the *Filioque*, which you have sacrilegiously added to the Constantinople-Nicene Creed, and respect our faith, which, on this point, is not only more "immemorial" than yours, but directly derived from the divine Scriptures!

Ergo, as the Greeks will have nothing to do with

the *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed, and Pusey will not hear of abandoning it, the scheme of the EIRENICON for the union of the two Churches, considered in the abstract is phantasmagorial, in the concrete is a snare.

We now come to the sophism of the whole of the EIRENICON, of not recognizing the "living Church," except in the union of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican. This sophism attains its zenith when Pusey opposes it to the still more abominable sophism of Manning, who recognizes none but the Roman as a living Church (pp. 83, 84). Now, is it not strange, that while Pusey refuses the Roman Church the exclusive privilege of being "the Church," he finds this privilege rests exclusively with the three Churches "concurrently," and in those three alone? What, then, are all the other Churches? Is it possible that the Holy Spirit neither can nor ought to speak; and does not, in fact, speak to the Lutheran, Calvinist, Moravian, Waldensian, and Italian Churches? What are these Churches if the Holy Spirit is not with them? Worse than paganism and infidelity. Are such sentiments worthy of a Christian heart? Are not such assertions a sin against charity?

But what, then, is the speciality of these three Churches, that they alone should constitute Christendom, to the exclusion of all other Christian Churches? The EIRENICON repeatedly sets before us their episcopacy and their apostolic succession. But in this lies the sophism. With regard to the episcopacy, it is but a question of names and designation. If the episcopacy is what comes to us from the Bible, it

implies nothing but seniority with superintendence. Wherever, then, there are superintendent elders appointed by the Church for that office, there is, in substance, episcopacy. If, however, by episcopacy is meant a set of men elected in a certain manner by the powers that be, and ordained according to a certain established formulary, so that beyond this order, which is almost analogous in the three Churches, there can be neither bishops nor episcopacy according to the New Testament, in that case the episcopate would cease to be an institution of the Church of Christ, and become a mere form. It would consequently no longer be the Christian episcopate for the things of the spirit, but would become an office of the State, stereotyped in the same way as the masters of masonic lodges, or the knights of secular orders are created. Again, if by episcopacy nothing but prelaticism is implied, in that case, to cut short so absurd an argument, unless God should be pleased to renew the prodigy of Balaam's ass in the Church, it will certainly not be by means of prelatic pride that the Holy Spirit will speak to the Church, the very title of prelate excluding that of bishop. *Ergo*, to be a Church of Christianity it is not necessary to have bishops according to the forms which so much delight Du Pin in the English ordination (p. 232). When there are overseers in the biblical sense, then there may be episcopate and Christianity without alloy.

With regard to the apostolic succession of person and doctrines, I think it would be insolence to limit it to the three Churches only. Pusey himself is constrained to admit (p. 87), "God, the Holy Ghost,

ordains the succession of pastors, doctors, bishops, through whom He continually propagates the truth." This is an admission that there may be an apostolic succession of pastors even without an episcopate, from which it may be concluded that there is apostolic succession even beyond the three Churches.

With regard to succession, I observe, in the first place, that if it is necessary to constitute a Church, it does not fail in any of the great Protestant sections. Almost all the Reformers had received the apostolic succession of the pastorate in their ordination by the bishops of the Roman Church, and they have transmitted it to their successors down to the present time; *ergo*, in all the Protestant Churches there is the apostolic succession of person, and all ought to be admitted to the benefit of the reunion of Christendom.

I observe, in the second place, that the apostolic succession of persons cannot be necessary to constitute a Church. If a distant country were converted to the faith by a layman, and the people believed sincerely in Christ and his Gospel, they would be a Christian people, would form a true Church, and the pastors chosen by them, according to New Testament rule, would constitute a true evangelical ministry, even without apostolic succession of persons.

I observe, lastly, that if personal apostolic succession were necessary to constitute a true Church, none of the Churches of the West would be a true Church at the present day, since in none is there personal apostolic succession. As there can be no apostolic succession where there is no apostle from which it can be directly derived, the apostolic succession of the

Churches of the West is but a fable and imagination. They, in fact, pretend to derive it from Rome ; Rome pretends to derive it from the Apostle Peter ; but the Apostle Peter NEVER WAS AT ROME ; *ergo*, the apostolic succession of the Churches of the West is but a fable and imagination. If the English Church has no other apostolic succession than that, notwithstanding Pearson's book, its apostolic succession is nothing but a soap-bubble, beautiful enough when illumined by the sun, but of no consistency whatever. If it were sought to derive it from the Apostle Paul and his successors down to Pius IX., it might perhaps be admitted in the Churches of the West, and, consequently, in the English. But to derive it absolutely and necessarily from Peter, who NEVER WAS AT ROME, is to have no apostolic succession at all.

Admitting even the succession of the Apostle Paul, I would, however, inquire how it has arrived to us through the medium of the antipopes and the heretic popes, or, to avail myself of the expression of Cardinal Baronio, the apostate popes ? Can the succession have been transmitted through such a medium ? Has it not been *de facto* interrupted ? Would the descendants of an ancient illustrious house be legitimate if in the genealogical line were found two or three maternal ancestors whose heirs were the offspring of adultery ? The legal axiom may suffice in the eyes of judges—*fili sunt cujus nuptiæ demonstrant*, but not in the eyes of common sense and public opinion ; therefore, where there has not been continued apostolic succession of doctrine, I do not admit of an apostolic succession of persons otherwise than as a farce or curiosity.

Now, with regard to the apostolic succession of doctrine, thank God it is not confined to the three Churches of Rome, Greece, and England; therefore, whatever be the name of the Church which retains the doctrine of Christ as preached by the apostles, in that Church apostolic succession lives and flourishes, and it is a Church which enjoys the Divine approval. What would the apostolic succession of persons be without that of doctrine?—a picture which, though perhaps well painted, would have neither life nor speech. But where there is the doctrine of Christ, there is the Christian Church—the Church against which the gates of hell shall not prevail—a glorious promise made by the Redeemer, not to the three Churches of the *EBRENICON*, but to his own Church, formed of all the different Christian families who retain the doctrine of the Christ-God. He who would cavil in a contrary sense would be the author of a sophism, and the sophism which should recognize but three Churches would reduce itself to a snare.

What Jerome writes of the universal Church, in his time altogether infected by Arianism, with the exception of Athanasius and his few adherents, proves that it is the apostolic succession of doctrine which alone constitutes the true Church of Christ. Though in that age of universal heresy the Church consisted of only Athanasius and his few followers, from this Church exclusively has the apostolic doctrine descended to later ages.

Ergo, to make it appear that there is no true Church of Christ beyond the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches, is an insult; *ergo*, to pretend that

those three Churches include the whole of Christendom is a deception ; *ergo*, to insist that no union is desirable except with these three Churches, is an impertinence.

The EIRENICON does not look beyond these three Churches : *ergo*, the EIRENICON is a snare.

II.

COUNCILS.

With regard to Councils *per se*, I have nothing to object. It is but reasonable that as men meet together in assemblies and parliaments for the affairs of society, they should also meet in council for the affairs of the Church. But what I deny in the most absolute manner is that the assistance of the Holy Spirit is promised to councils to a greater extent than it was promised by Christ to the two or three who shall gather together in his name. I deny further to councils the haughty prerogative of infallibility, which, according to Pusey's own saying, is not inherent to them, since, according to the language of the English Church, they may err, and, according to the language of Bellarmine, they have erred. I deny also to councils the power of creating new dogma. They have no authority but to protest *de fide* against all new heresies, and oppose them by what they find *de fide* in the Bible. I deny, lastly, that there can be no Church Christianity except that which accepts what the councils have decreed. The Christianity of a Church

depends upon the scriptural *quid*, and not upon the consistorial *quantum* of doctrine which it receives and teaches.

With this premised, I come to the councils of the two Churches. They equally admit the first six œcumenic councils, simply because they were œcumenic, and therefore their reunion, according to the EIRENICON, in this respect, is as easy as it is logical and authoritative. But gently. I have something to say against such logic and authority. Is it logical to call them œcumenic? Were they œcumenic or general, in the strict sense of the word? What special characteristics have they which subsequent œcumenic councils have not, but which are not admitted to be such by the English Church? In the answer to these questions lies the snare of the EIRENICON. The first councils of the Church were almost all exclusively oriental, the second were almost all exclusively occidental. In the first Nicene Council there was but one single Latin bishop present; in the following councils of Constantinople, Ephesus, &c., &c., there were present only the legates of the Bishop of Rome, who was not yet either primate or pope, and, consequently, could not represent the Latin Church in his legates; *ergo*, they were not œcumenic councils. Reverse the position now, and you will see that at the Lateran Council, and those of Pisa, Lyon, Trent, &c., the Eastern Church was either not represented at all, or had only sectarian representatives; *ergo*, they were not œcumenic councils. The only truly œcumenic council was that of Florence; but, precisely because it was œcumenic, it ended in a complete failure.

I will say but little upon the authority of the councils. Pusey himself admits that their definition is not obligatory *de jure* but only *de facto*, when their canons have been subsequently and voluntarily accepted by all the Churches.

Ergo, the authority is not in the council which decrees, but in the unanimous consent of the Churches which accept its decrees, and by accepting, sanction them. The councils, then, have no dogmatic authority *per se*, and this implies that if the English Church believes itself to be the depository of the apostolic doctrine as held by all the Christian Churches, it has no need of one, of six, or of twenty councils to unite with such Churches, but the doctrine itself suffices to prove to them its character of Christianity.

We now come more particularly to the snare of the EIRENICON. The Roman Church, even not admitting its maximum of eighteen general councils, will not consent to descend below the minimum of fifteen, and this compromise is not without protest and opposition. Those who retain only the minimum, if they are not called heretics, are, at least, considered as daring and presumptuous. On the other hand, the English Church admits the existence of only six councils, called œcumenic, and will not agree to a higher number. How, then, can Pusey assert that the reunion of the two Churches is perfectly possible because both admit the same councils? Is not this a snare? It is true that the two Churches equally admit the first six councils, but besides the six thus equally admitted the Roman Church will have another twelve. These other twelve the English Church

would not recognize at the time of the Reformation, and could not recognize them at the present day without denying itself; *ergo*, a reunion of the two Churches, on pretence of uniformity of councils, is no other than a snare.

According to my view, the snare becomes worse and more dangerous as I reflect upon the ecstasy with which Pusey contemplates his future eighth general council, which, according to him, will represent "the once more united Christendom" (p. 268). In mentioning the eighth general council, he recognizes that of Trent as a general council, which thus becomes art and part of the Articles of the Prayer Book. Is not this a snare? Would not that seventh council, thus accepted, entirely destroy the English dogma? What would the eighth Puseyitic council be but the seal upon the sepulchre of the Anglican Church done to death by the EIRENICON?

No, no. So long as the Council of Trent remains, as it is, the antagonist of the Reformation and the supporter of all the errors of Romanism, a Church which respects itself and holds itself to be Christian, like the English, cannot and ought not to have anything to do with the Church of such a nefarious council. On their parts, let *bonâ-fide* Churchmen beware of being taken in this snare, which involves the loss and ruin of their Church. If, on the one hand, it is impossible that the Roman Church should limit itself to the six councils alone admitted by the Anglican, and if, on the other hand, it is impossible that the English Church should adopt either Pusey's *minimum* of eight councils, or the *medium* of

the Gallicans of fifteen councils, or the *maximum* of the Ultramontanists of eighteen councils, the reunion of the two Churches is no less absolutely impossible; and even the very proposal of it, on pretence of the similarity of the councils, is only a snare. But the EIRENICON proposes it on the pretence of similarity.

Ergo, the EIRENICON is a snare.

III.

CREEDS.

I observe here, in a general sense, that I attach to creeds only a secondary and purely relative importance. Creeds are not in themselves the faith or the dogma to be believed, but only its form. In an absolute sense, no Church creed is necessary to salvation, but the Bible alone, which bears testimony of Christ, and which contains all that can render the man of God perfect. The Bible is the sole depository of Divine authority—authority which cannot belong to any Church creed except at second-hand and by reflection.

Not that I deny the utility of these declarative professions of faith; but I desire that it should be known to all, and remain fixed as a precise term in the present controversy, that, because a thing is useful, that is no reason it should be necessary of absolute necessity. The expression, "I believe in the whole Bible," is too general, and may easily be abused by heretics of every sort. It, therefore, seems

to me useful that every Church should adopt a didactic formulary, in which is compendiously laid down, as in a synoptical table, all the dogmatic instructions of the Bible, in order to avoid deviation in the mode of belief. Hence it follows that the creed, or profession of faith, is not the treasure of faith, but simply the receptacle containing it, and which contains just as much of it as is put into it. I therefore trouble myself very little as to whether the receptacle was manufactured at Nice or Constantinople, provided the treasure it contains be scriptural. If the treasure it contains is scriptural, it is all one to me whether the receptacle itself is of ancient or contemporaneous workmanship. I regard the substance of the thing, and not its form and appearance. All these creeds, excepting, perhaps, the Apostles', owe their origin to heresy, and were drawn up to oppose the dominant heresies of their times, especially those of Arianism and Praxeism. I maintain, however, that this mode of opposition was certainly not the best. Heretics, as such, go beyond the Bible and its right sense. To oppose them, then, it is by no means necessary to invent new terms; but it is sufficient, indeed necessary, to keep to those of the Bible, and explain the Bible by means of itself. While the creation of new theological and scholastic terms can never have the authority of the Bible, and consequently cannot bind to faith like the Bible, it is almost always productive of cavils, quibbles, misunderstandings, and, not unfrequently, of a species of counter-heresy little worse than that which it is sought to combat.

My want of confidence in creeds grows immeasurably when I reflect upon their inherent imperfection. They are inevitably either partial, or limited, or incomplete, or obscure, or sectarian. None of them are perfect. The three creeds adopted by the English Church are not without defects. The Apostles' Creed, so called, taken as a whole, is but historical of Christ the Redeemer; the Nicene is a theoretically scholastic creed, but is absolutely wanting in the doctrine of election; the Athanasian Creed, the apocryphal composition of a half-crazy monk, reduces itself to the riddle of a sphynx, while, in its condemnatory clauses, it belongs to the religion of Belial or Juggernaut.

The English Church has adopted these three creeds, because they may be proved by the Bible. Well, if they have no authority in themselves, and would be less than nothing unless they could be proved from the Bible, I prefer to take my stand upon the Bible, which has no need of such proofs and such credentials, and esteem these creeds for what they are worth—useful to a Church, as forming a common standard and a legal measurement with regard to things to be believed.

What I have stated serves a direct purpose in my present answer. The reunion, with a view to the similarity of creeds and their common acceptation, is a reunion of form and not of substance. And, in truth, the three Churches which have the three said creeds in common, accuse themselves mutually, on the ground that they are not dogmatic in regard to matters of belief, and that in not a few points of the

most essential importance. Thus, we have a communion of creeds, but not a communion of faith; and by their common acceptance we obtain a reunion in the terms of theology and scholasticism, but not a reunion in the terms of the Bible. And this I call a snare.

The snare of the EIRENICON reaches its limits in its reticence and suppression of the truth, which I refrain from calling cunning. It feigns to ignore, and passes over in complete silence, the existence of a fourth creed in the Roman Church—a creed altogether its own, œcumenical and obligatory, commonly known by the name of its author, as the Creed of Pius IV. This creed, which is the very essence of the Tridentine Council, is as dogmatic in the Roman Church as any of the three primitive creeds, and, indeed, to a greater extent. Being the expression of its last Œcumenic Council, it more particularly declares and propounds the mind of that Church against the last so-called errors of the Reformation.

And that it is such in the estimation of the Church is sufficiently proved by the fact that it is imposed compulsorily upon ecclesiastics who enter upon the ministry of the Word and of souls, as well as upon all the candidates for degrees in the Catholic universities, where the Church is dominant. For no one can become a preacher, or parish priest, or bishop, or doctor, in any faculty whatever, without having taken his oath upon the creed of Pius IV., which is always, in such cases, added to the Nicene.

In order that the reader who is not acquainted with this iniquitous creed may know it fully, I give

it here in its integrity, convinced that its simple perusal will at once show its intrinsic badness and the complete apostasy of Rome :

"I must firmly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and the other constitutions and observances of the same Church.

"I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to that sense, which the holy mother Church has held, and does hold, whose province it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

"I profess also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of mankind, though all are not necessary to every one; namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, order and matrimony, and that they confer grace; and of those, that baptism, confirmation, and order, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.

"I also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic Church received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above sacraments.

"I receive and embrace all and every one of the things, which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

"I profess likewise, that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrifice of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation.

"I confess also, that, under either kind alone, whole and entire Christ and a true sacrament is received.

"I constantly hold, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

"Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be venerated and invoked; that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their reliques are to be venerated.

"I must firmly assert that the images of Christ and of the mother of God ever virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained; and that the honour and veneration are to be given to them.

"I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

"I acknowledge the holy, Catholic, and apostolical Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Bishop, the successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and the vicar of Jesus Christ.

"I also undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the most holy Council of Trent; and at the same time I likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church.

"This true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear that I will most constantly hold and profess the same, whole and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life; and that I will procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be held, taught, and preached, by those who are under me, or by those, the care of whom shall belong to me, by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these God's holy gospels."

Now, I would ask, does Pusey know or does he not know of the existence of this abominable creed? If not (which is, however, physically impossible), I would advise him to study his subject before he talks of reunion. If he does, then his proposal of the reunion, while he feigns to be ignorant of the existence of this fourth creed, may with the utmost accuracy be characterized as a snare. Even if the Roman Church were to consent to the reunion, it would still expect the English Church to accept its creed of Pius IV. as a *conditio sine quâ non*; nor could it be otherwise. The formulary of this creed contains not only the *quasi de fide*, but, in a great measure, the *de fide* absolutely; it contains the dogmatism of Rome with its most impudent innovations; it contains the true essence of actual Romanism, without which the Roman Church would instantly cease to be Roman. Therefore the Roman Church neither can nor will come to any compromise with regard to this creed, and the English Church must accept it *volens volens*. Now, can the English Church accept it under any restriction whatever? No! If it did, it would instantly cease to be the English Church.

Ergo, one of two things: either reunion without mentioning this creed, which is impossible on the part of the Church of Rome; or reunion with the acceptance of this creed, which is impossible on the part of the English Church.

The EIRENICON, to avoid every difficulty, proposes the reunion on the pretence of having the same three creeds in common, and deceitfully hides the fourth from the English, who are ignorant of it and its absolute obligation.

Ergo, the EIRENICON is a snare.

IV.

PRACTICAL SYSTEM.

The title *practical system* may be understood differently or of different things according to various schools, and I shall, therefore, include in it three items: Worship, Doctrine, and Maryolatry.

(a.) *Worship*.—Pusey, with a good faith worthy of a better cause, hopes that, in the reunion, Rome will not impose her practical system upon the English Church, to which the said system is repugnant (pp. 209, 210, and *passim*); and he fears that if she would impose it, the reunion cannot be effected. This is true enough as relates to the orthodox Church of England, but is an unfounded fear if considered in reference to the new heresy of the Ritualists. They have already introduced the practical system of Rome into the simple and spiritual worship of the Anglican

Church, and converted the latter into the materiality, theatricalness, and Paganism of the Church of Rome. Pusey may, perhaps, not be responsible for the aberrations of his Puseyites. It is, however, none the less true that, in their ritualistic mania, they have even exaggerated, aggravated, and deteriorated the practical system of Rome, in reference to which Pusey feels so much apprehension.

With the true sapience and acuteness of a veteran observer, Pusey has pronounced (p. 12)—“people are curious, not about the indigenous productions of a country, but about exotics.” And this is precisely the case in reference to his Ultramontane—Tractarian—Puseyitic Iscariots. Becoming disgusted with the indigenous productions of the Prayer Book, they have gone and grubbed up the exotic forms of the Breviary, the Missal, the Pontifical, and the Ceremonial of Rome, to introduce them as curiosities and novelties into the Anglican worship. And in many respects and many churches they have carried their perversion still farther. Acting upon their favourite and impious principle, that “what was not specifically forbidden at the Reformation is still legal,”* they seek to revive all the Papistic ceremonialisms, entirely suppressed by the publication of the Articles in 1571, and, what is still worse, accompanied with the stupid pomp and barbaric forms of the middle ages. And this rubbish they impudently call a blessing for England, while they pour forth blasphemy and insult against those who have the courage to oppose or lack the courage to promote it. In order to prove that I

* *Union Review*, Jan. 1866, p. 115.

do not exaggerate, I copy a portion of a speech of one of these sacred clowns who may excite the envy of their less favoured brethren of the circus and the stage:—"When we bear in mind, that of the recent blessed restorations in the English Church, early communions, choral services, special vestments, nunneries, brotherhoods, retreats, missions and theological colleges are all common both to Rome and England, we may be safe in ignoring the wretched prejudices of the timid, to whom anything Roman is a bugbear."

Must not this be called the re-Romanizing of England? Can the credit of being the chosen instruments in the carrying out of so diabolical a mission be refused to the Ritualists? Of what avail to the English Church are the blood of its martyrs, the piety of its Reformers, the orthodoxy of its Articles, if, in the course of a few years, this audacious, impudent, insolent sect has introduced sacrilege into the temple, and rendered it abominable to God by the profanity of its Pagan rites? Everything in these churches breathes Pagan profanity. Flowers, lace, embroidery, mottoes, monograms, symbols, idols, incense, vestments, genuflexions, chaunts—all is profane, all is Pagan, all is the honour and WORSHIP OF SATAN; God will not be adored with such materialness, and lie but only in spirit and in truth.†

I am not ignorant that this new system of ceremonialism is necessary to a certain portion of Churchmen, who, having abandoned the Bible, and with it spiritual piety and heart religion, require to substitute

* *Union Review*, XIX., p. 119.

† John iv. 24.

for them a worship which satisfies the senses, pleases the imagination, and favours and flatters all the lowest passions. But withal, it is still the practical system of Rome, and often but a bad caricature of that system. It must, therefore, be abomination in the sight of God, from its similarity to the worship paid to Satan by Pagans both ancient and modern.

Speaking of such fashionable congregations, well might the Bishop of Gloucester say, with incautious words, of which I would not claim the authorship in the face of the Church, nor the responsibility at God's tribunal, that, at the present day, the people no longer like the "cheerless and joyless" service of God; and that, consequently, it is necessary to transfer the gaiety and pomp of Her Majesty's and Covent Garden theatres to the church. I will, however, say to the reverend prelate with old Horace, *non est hic locus*. You may be certain, if you change the church into a theatre, that all you will there find will be nothing more nor less than the malediction of God. What may be innocent and harmless in the temple of the arts becomes profanation, sacrilege, and impiety in the temple of God, and consequently is an abomination to the Lord, and by him accursed. Oh! how much better does the condemnation of these mysteries of the great Harlot sound in the mouth of the Bishop of Lincoln, who speaks of the ritualism of the present day as a garment and mask to cover the corruption and nakedness of those fashionable congregations, who seek to supply their want of faith and spirituality by the harlequinade of their worship

and their mechanical performances. Thus, instead of men they have automata, instead of Christians they have Ritualists, instead of the piety which feels and adores, they have the purse which pays for all this rubbish, and they think to purchase heaven by a show of millinery, and flowers, and buffoonery.

This perversion has already become the practical system of the Tractarians, who have already introduced it into the English Church.

Ergo, the EIRENICON, which fears that the said system may be imposed upon the Church of England in the reunion, is only a snare.

(b.) *Doctrine*.—Under this name is comprehended everything which the Church of Rome has not defined *de fide*, and which is taught by her as *quasi de fide*, but which in her practical system resolves itself really into dogma *de fide*. With the astuteness and cunning proper to the Roman Church, the Tridentine Council, as Pusey himself observes (p. 209), left the practical system at the same point of abomination in which it found it, and gave it besides “an indirect sanction . . . laying down as *de fide* certain statements which lay at the root of that practical system.” Thus the Roman Church, which calls herself “mother and mistress” of all Churches, shows herself worthy of her “scriptural appellation of ‘Mother of Harlots.’” In fact, while in controversy she says, from Bellarmine to Milner, that Catholics are not obliged to believe in such and such doctrines, as not being *de fide*, in practice if they do not believe them, in case she is powerless to punish, she calls them only half converts, as I am assured by

the EIRENICON itself (p. 108), and where she can castigate them, she does so with all the amenities of her inquisition.

The practical system, then, at the present day is so completely amalgamated with the dogmatic that it would require more than a Galileo to discover the difference, and more than a Fergusson to analyse it. It is worth repeating, that it is the system of falsehood, *par excellence*, and the *chef-d'œuvre* of Satan. It does not prescribe *de fide*, that which it demands shall be believed *de fide*; and, on the other hand, the habit of believing doctrines *de fide*, which are only *quasi de fide*, has resulted in the consequence that the practical system is believed to be absolutely obligatory and necessary to salvation. "For it is taught by her priests, put forth as certain truth and as her teaching, in books which have the sanction of her bishops, and by writers who have been canonized" (pp. 209, 210).

If, then, the doctrine of the Church of Rome is one and the same thing in practice with the dogma of that Church; if it is not merely the skin and rouge of the old harlot, but her flesh and blood, and bones and marrow; if the practical system is with her essentially a question of "to be, or not to be," upon what foundation does Pusey base his hopes that such doctrines will not be imposed upon the English Church by the act of reunion (p. 210)? This it is which leads me to conclude that the EIRENICON is not only an hallucination, but indeed a snare. Can Rome do without her doctrines? No. Can she dispense with them in the Churches which desire to unite with her? No. In the former case, the Roman Church would cease

to be the Roman Church; in the latter case, the Churches united to her could not be called Catholic Churches resembling her; *ergo*, she "need insist that the Church of England, if united with her, should receive them" (doctrines).

And here enters the snare of the EIRENICON, which suggests that "provision might be formally made on both sides that she need not" (*Ib.*). What, then, are these *Eirenical* provisions? what their nature and extent? They are nothing else than the usual mental restrictions *à la Du Pin*, and which would surely end in the introduction and acceptance of the practical system also on the part of the English Church. I will take three facts to prove this.

Pusey, with the sentiments of a Bible Christian, condemns saintology; but, at the same time, he tries to prove that it is only the abuse of images which is condemned by the English Church, as it is, indeed, equally condemned by the Tridentine Council. Here is the snare. Introduce images, and saintolatry will be the necessary consequence; grant the Church the use of images, and their abuse will follow as effect follows cause. This is proved by the history of all times, and all peoples, and all Churches, the English included, before the Reformation. The same thing is proved at the present day by what has taken place among his own Puseyites, who, having introduced images, have already begun to venerate and invoke them.

The same subtlety is observed with regard to the doctrine of purgatory. The Council of Trent defines only the prison and the imprisonment of souls as pun-

ishment; Pusey admits that there may be a place for souls departed from this world, and which are fit neither for heaven nor hell; therefore they may agree upon the doctrine of the prison of purgatory. That is sufficient for the Church of Rome, for she knows well that imprisoned souls cannot remain in a passive state, that passiveness would not purify them nor prepare them for heaven; and as they cannot read either the glories of Mary by Liguori, nor the paradise of the soul by Pusey, it is necessary to employ fire to purify them and fit them for the thrones of paradise. When once the prison of purgatory has been admitted, the fire will be as inseparable from the prison, in the English belief, as it is now in the Roman belief.

The same may be predicated of everything relating to the infamous doctrine of the confessional. The Roman Church does not deny that the pardon of sins may be obtained by perfect contrition; but as she looks upon perfect contrition as almost impossible, she imposes her sacrament of confession for the absolution of sins; and Pusey melts into devout ecstasies at the thought that, though there is not the sacrament in the English Church, yet there is confession and absolution of sins; *ergo*, a compromise may be made between the two Churches with regard to confession; *ergo*, the reunion with this much-contested point of doctrine is not impossible; *ergo*, the EIRENICON is a snare.

God pardon Pusey if, in consequence of his unqualified adhesion to the system of confession and the authority which he has given to it by his words, writings, and practice, he should be the cause of the

ruin of even a single soul and of the future immorality of the English Church and people! I would that it should be known to all Protestants most explicitly and absolutely, that the fruits of the confessional consist of little else than immorality. The clergy are thus determined upon commanding the practice, because it is the surest way of setting a spy upon families, governing them, and robbing them of their money, peace, and virtue. By means of the confessional, children are stolen from their parents; the most poisonous doctrines are instilled into the minds of the innocent; friendships are formed which result in the dishonour of girls, and the infidelity of wives. On the other hand, the laity, more particularly the feminine sex, is enthusiastic for the confessional, because it easily and cheaply administers an artificial peace to the conscience by the absolution of the priest, and allows the people larger liberty in gratifying their passions and repeating their sins, they having at hand the panacea of the apocryphal sacrament. Oh! if the fathers and husbands of England could but for a moment imagine what passes in the confessionals of Romanism and Tractarianism, I am certain that, even at the cost of blood, they would imitate their glorious forefathers in clearing their country of this market of infamy and immorality—the confessional.

The doctrines, then, which form the practical system of the Roman Church, are impossible in the true English Church; but Rome, who would not renounce them at the Council of Florence in favour of the Greeks—Rome, who did not renounce them at the Council of Trent in favour of the Reformers—

Rome cannot renounce them, at the present day, in favour of the English Church ; *ergo*, their reunion is impossible. But Pusey thinks the reunion may be obtained by means of "provisions," which cannot be acceptable to either party ; *ergo*, the EIRENICON is a snare.

(c.) *Maryolatry*.—On this subject, I am glad, very glad, to be able to pay a tribute of respect and gratitude to Dr. Pusey for all that he has written against the system of Maryolatry. I trust he will permit me frankly to assure him that this is the only orthodox part of his EIRENICON—the part which may do good to his party, if his disciples are not of the race which receive only deception and error from their masters, and feign to ignore their teachings of truth, or declare they will not embrace them. His beautiful historic pages in relation to all the extravagances and blasphemies hitherto penned by demented Papists in favour of Mary and her worship, and his learned scholastic observations in relation to the baneful dogma of the immaculate conception of Mary, recently defined *de empietate* by Pius IX., I do not hesitate to proclaim as a standard treatise against every sort of Maryolatry.

In this part, the EIRENICON is perfect. The idolatry of the worship is proved beyond all cavil, and the ultimate end to which this worship tends is clearly shown—the dethronement of Christ, who will lose his followers in consequence of the unscriptural usurpation of his mother. When the creature is deified, even though that creature be Mary, Christ must, of necessity, be undeified in the hearts of the adorers of

a woman! In all this Dr. Pusey is precisely the right man in the right place, and I congratulate him upon having, through these splendid pages, incurred the wrath of Ultramontaniam. Among others who attack him is the mock bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Ullathorne, who, in a recently-published letter, defends his dear Father Newman from the charge of semi-Maryolatry imputed to him in the *EIRENICON*. Semi-Maryolatry! Newman a semi-Maryolater! The author of Tract 90, the great convert of Oxford, the transplanter of the Oratorians to England, a semi-Maryolater!! *Pro Hercule!* this is too much; and so we have the good Newman defended from the heretical imputation. In spite of the *EIRENICON*, he appears *Ullathorneley* an ultra-Maryolater. Poor blind things! they stumble in the dark and speak of day, but their sun is only night. Where Mary is, there Christ cannot be; he suffers no one to interfere in the things of his eternal Father. Does the moon care for the baying of the dogs? And so it is with Christian hearts, who, having none but Jesus, refuse the invocation, mediation, or assistance of any creature, and condemn and oppose all worship which is not paid to Christ-God. Papist and pro-Papist Catholics, being unable to reproach us with our faith in Christ, reproach us because we will have only Christ. Yes, yes; Christ alone, and no other. "But what harm has Mary done you," they ask, "that you are so opposed to her honour?" No harm whatever; on the contrary, she has done us much good in giving us the humanity of Jesus; and, on this account, we love her and esteem her above every other creature; but

we do not honour her with any kind of worship, as that would be idolatry. We do not deify her with any power, as that would be sacrilege; and even without Mary—indeed, absolutely without Mary—we shall be saved. We look for our salvation exclusively from Jesus, in whose name alone is there salvation; nor should we care to be saved by a woman, who had need of the redemption of Christ in order to be saved herself.

Well, if the EIRENICON is so orthodox against Maryolatry, where and how can it contain the snare? The snare is not in the fact itself, but in the application. Here it is (p. 110): "The large system as to the Blessed Virgin, unknown as it was to the ancient Church, has a quasi-authority in the Roman Church (at least, it is set forth in her name), moulds, and necessarily must mould, a great part of the private devotions in the Roman Church." This is a triple snare; a snare the "quasi-authority," for it is true authority, absolute authority, dogmatic authority, Tridentine authority, authority of the creed, authority of the universal Roman Church. I speak not of minutiae and details, I speak of the system in itself. The Church which has created a special worship of *hyperdulia* for Mary—worship which is, in fact, no other than "a sort of *Latreia*" (p. 184)—has thus dogmatically authorized the unknown system of Maryolatry.

Further, it is a snare to think that this Maryan system "is set forth in her name." Here we have nothing to do with the priests who preach it, or the books that teach it, but with the Church in itself; and I say and maintain that it is the Church of Rome

which teaches and inculcates it as the Roman Church directly, and not by any secondary organ. Pusey should not have recourse to the maniacal aberrations of Liguori and Faber to conclude that this system is put forward by others in the name of the Church, but not by the Church itself. From whom did the Liguoris, and Fabers, and all the other Marymaniacs imbibe their aberrations? Certainly from the Church. Who approved them, sanctioned their writings, and, in some cases, canonized the authors? Certainly the Church. It is the Church, then, who is guilty of Maryolatry. Pusey will find my conclusion logical, if he will seek Maryolatry in the Breviary and the Roman Missal, which are not books "set forth" in the name of the Roman Church, but books given by her to the people, and invested by her with quasi-divine authority.

Finally, it is a snare so to limit the action of this system as to say it "moulds a great part of the private devotions in the Roman Church." I do not deny the lamentable fact that Mary is become all, in all, and for all, in Papist devotions, both individual and domestic. Hearts which have lost the hardy robustness of faith in Christ the King of Glory, find no other compensation than to throw themselves at the feet of a woman with a baby in her arms, which has ever been the favourite idol of effeminate Pagans, from the ancient times of Memphis and Babylon to the contemporaneous times of Calcutta and Peking. But I do deny that the Maryan system ends with the "private devotions in the Roman Church." Can Pusey be ignorant of the public vows which are made

to Mary by cities and nations, in order to be freed from wars, pestilences, earthquakes, famines, and every other Divine visitation? Is he ignorant of the public monuments raised to Mary in proofs of affection and gratitude for supposed favours? Is he ignorant that cities, kingdoms, and empires are publicly dedicated to her, are considered as her property, and that in them she is *magna domina* and absolute patron? Is he ignorant, in short, of the titles, honours, days, and festivals decreed to her by the Church itself, which has accorded far more solemn commemorations to Mary than to Christ? And is not all this public devotion, Church devotion, devotion inseparable from Roman Catholicism?

Maryolatry, then, is something more than *quasi de fide*; "it melts very much into the *de fide*," if, indeed, it is not the same thing with the *de fide*, as proved by not a few bishops in their answer to Pius IX. on the point of the Immaculate Conception. But even though it were only "almost of faith," or a simple doctrine in the Church of Rome, yet, as I have proved in the preceding paragraph, it could not be accepted by the English Church in its reunion with Rome, which Pusey himself wisely admits (p. 111); *ergo*, Maryolatry is an impossible term in the reunion. The EIRENICON hopes that the term will not be imposed, but the Roman Church cannot dispense with it.

Ergo, the EIRENICON is a snare.

Thus it appears to me that I have, in a great measure, fulfilled the promise which I have elsewhere made (Chap. I. 7), to prove the impossibility of the reunion by the definition of the dogma of the

Immaculate Conception of Mary. This abominable dogma is founded upon a passage of the Bible, corrupted and wrongly applied, where it is said, in Genesis, *ipsa conteret*, instead of *ipse conteret*; and it has been taught that the passage relates to Mary. This abominable dogma overturns the whole system and economy of the redemption of Christ, by admitting his mother as co-redeemer and co-mediatrix for the human race. This abominable dogma is an article *de fide*, at the present day, in the Roman Church. Here, then, there is no room for the pious hopes of Pusey—"there is a large scope for providing that our people should not be flooded with these devotions, which to us are most alien" (p.111). "Rome need not make such doctrines terms of communion" (p. 210). Here it is question of dogma, of article *de fide*, to which the Roman Church must, *de necessitate medii*, demand adhesion from all who desire to unite with her, as she demands belief from all her own Catholics; and it will not be otherwise.

The EIRENICON finds in Maryolatry only a quasi-authoritative system, while from the entrance into the system of the Immaculate Conception, it passes into the state and authority of *de fide*.

Ergo, the EIRENICON is a snare.

The EIRENICON thinks and hopes that in the reunion of the two Churches, Maryolatry, which is no longer a practical system, but is, at the present day, a dogmatic system, will not be imposed upon the English Church as a necessary term of reunion.

Ergo, the EIRENICON is a snare.

We will comprehend all in a brief

SUMMARY.

It is a snare to advocate the reunion on the pretext that there is no true Church except in the confessions of Rome, Greece, and England, thus excluding all the other confessions of Christendom.

It is a snare to advocate the reunion on the pretext that the number of received councils is equal, while in the Roman Church it is three times greater than in the English.

It is a snare to advocate the reunion on the pretext of similarity of creeds, when the Roman Church has one more than the English, and that one in its nature such, that it is absolutely impossible to accept it.

It is a snare to advocate the reunion on the pretext that the practical system of the Roman Church will not be imposed upon the Anglican, when the practical system of Rome in worship, doctrine, and Maryolatry is an essential part of the Roman Church, and not to be dispensed with in those who would unite with her.

Ergo, the EIRENICON is a snare.

CHAPTER IV.

THE INJUSTICE.

IN this chapter I would confine myself to a brief reproof and a suggestion. I undertake the office of critic less than that of accuser, and would denounce the EIRENICON to the English people as guilty of serious injustice against Protestantism in general, and the Protestant brethren at home in particular.

I believe myself to be in possession of the necessary qualification for this important and, under present circumstances, this solemn and necessary office—the qualification of neutrality. If I belonged to one of the contending parties, Churchmen might suspect that I revealed the injustice of the EIRENICON to favour the cause of the Dissenters; and, on their part, the Dissenters might think that I was acting in the interest of Churchmen. As I am, however, neutral, those who reason with their minds and hearts will conclude that I write this chapter for the advantage of both sides equally, and for the triumph of the

glorious principles of the Reformation in this still too much divided England.

But who are you to bring an accusation of injustice against a name so much respected, and against so haughty and powerful a party? What are your principles? What is your faith? What is your Church? What is your object? What is your neutrality? Who and what I am the reader will see on the title-page of this book, and that is enough. With regard to my profession of faith, I will repeat for the last time—what I have printed at least twenty times, and preached more than a thousand—that I am an Evangelical Christian of the Italian Church, as established in Rome by the Apostle St. Paul, without Popes and without Popery. But so it is; there is a race of fanatics and bigots even in England for whom there is neither piety, religion, faith, nor salvation beyond their own exclusive number, and with whom no one can pass for a converted Christian man unless he is accompanied by a trumpeter and the town crier to proclaim his conversion, or has adopted the grimaces and sighings of charlatan hypocrisy in order to convince bystanders of his Christianity. I abhor such arts, and leave it to professional humbugs to make merchandize of hypocrisy, while I rest satisfied with the modest profession of faith in my Saviour Jesus, in loving him in sincerity, and trying to draw as many of my wandering brethren as I may be permitted to faith in him and his gospel.

With regard to my object, it is complex; the opposition of error and the advancement of truth. This it is which has gained me so large a number of

enemies, even among those who profess to be religious. But I shall not abandon my post on account either of the number or the malignity of my enemies.

This is my neutrality, thanks to which I am superior to the bickerings which divide the various Protestant parties, and am able to feel myself the brother of every one who confesses Christ in sincerity. Doubtless, my desire to remain independent and neutral has not procured me too many friends among those who see no Church except in a sect ; but I can do without such friends ; indeed, I prefer to be without them, both in this country and my own. In my own, more particularly, a sad experience has taught me that the sects which send agents and missionaries to evangelize Italy have nothing in view but the glorification of their own denominations, by the transplanting of which to Italy we shall end miserably with religious strife and divisions. Thus, instead of having promoted the cause of Christ alone, these militant sects will have borne to Italy the germs which, before long, will eat out and destroy all hope of the religious evangelization and regeneration of the young country.

From this, the reader may see how logical I am in that, while I strive to promote the unity and brotherhood of the Churches of Italy (may the enemy not frustrate my efforts by means of the malicious arts of the Stewards and their adherents !) it is but natural that I should desire to see the reunion of the different denominations of England. How can that be ? How can you hold forth in favour of this reunion, when you write a book against reunion with Rome ? Because the reunion with Rome, at the same time

that it is impossible and fatal, involves an injustice to Protestantism. Had Pusey proposed both these reunions, and could both have been accomplished, I should have had no accusation to bring against anything or person. Further, if this were a case of *unum facere et alterum non omittere*, I would have the unionists to indulge their fancy for Rome while they did not neglect union at home. But the EIRENICON and its partisans speak only of union with Rome and Greece, and are silent about union with brothers in England, thus altogether excluding them from their scheme; and this it is which, according to logic, conscience, and the gospel, gives me a right to accuse the EIRENICON and its partisans of injustice.

Why all this mania for communion with Rome? If it were from true love of unity, why not commence at home? What union can you propose to Rome, and how can you expect to enjoy peace with her, when you cannot or will not unite with your own English brethren? I cannot here be told I am ill informed. Had I not the testimony of my eyes and my long experience, I should think I had obtained my information from a sure source in having derived it from the EIRENICON itself, whose authority upon the subject no one will dispute. The EIRENICON assures me that Pusey never knew Evangelical Churchmen until he had need of their assistance to combat the Essays. The EIRENICON tells me that Pusey knows nothing of Dissenters, but that they possess a fragmentary piety; that they have not a thread of life except where they come in contact with the Church; and that the little spirit which they manifest

is a *post-mortem* vitality remaining in them from the Church from which they have separated. This is all that Pusey knows of those who do not tractarianize after the black Harlot of Oxford.

Nor is he alone in this injustice. All High Churchmen feel more or less of this repugnance to Dissenters. I could cite thousands of facts relating to Churchmen and clergymen who would believe it a profanation to enter a Dissenting chapel, but no profanation to enter a Papistic church; and would esteem it sacrilege to shake the hand of a Dissenting minister, but no sacrilege to shake the hand of a Papist priest. This is injustice, all the more abominable in God's sight, in that it has been the principal cause that the Dissenters, on their part, by a kind of *lex talionis*, have descended to the same level, and repaid repugnance with repugnance, contempt with contempt, and aversion with aversion.

Commence the reunion, then, at home, before you propose it with Rome. Churchmen pretend that this is impossible, seeing that they feel a special antipathy against Dissenters, because these have separated from them. I tell Churchmen, that for the very same reason they will find it most difficult to unite with Rome, the latter cordially detesting them, because they have separated themselves from her. I do not admit the excuse that the English Church had just reasons for separating from Rome, because the Dissenters might well allege the same excuse and the same reasons as the cause of their separation from the English Church. Let us, then, leave excuses and reasons, and come to the remedy.

When Pusey could write a book of four hundred and nine pages to facilitate the reunion with Rome, and smooth the difficulties on both sides, why not write a little tract of a few pages to try to smooth the few difficulties which lie in the way of reunion between Church and Dissent? When Oxford has written ninety tracts for the apostacy of the English Church, is it impossible for Oxford to write a half-sheet pamphlet to strengthen the legitimate filial ties of the Church of the martyred Reformers? The distance which exists, at the present day, in dogma and doctrine, between the Churches of Rome and England, is more than a hundred miles; that which exists between Church and Dissent is less than ten miles. Well, then, why undertake the hundred miles journey with such alacrity, when the result is so uncertain, and refuse to perform the safe and easy journey of ten miles, with an almost certain result? If, even at the end of your long journey, you arrived at reunion with Rome, you would find yourself upon the borders of an abyss, into which you would be hurried; while, in reunion with Nonconformity, you would find family peace and the glory of Christian brotherhood. I am quite certain, from all that I hear and observe, that if the English Church did but follow out Pusey's motto, "Let us explain," they would come to an understanding between themselves; and by the removal of every cause of offence—which the EIRENICON seeks to effect with regard to Rome—two-thirds of the Dissenters would be brought to reunite with the Church, to make common cause, once more, against the common enemy, Rome.

Pusey and all his *Eirenicists* may be the quintessence of piety, *sui generis*, but they have certainly not yet learned the A B C of Christianity. If their "old Mother Catholic Church" had taught them anything good, it could but have begun with the maxim, "Justice before charity, and charity at home before charity abroad." When you go to Rome to offer and beg for union, while you are neglecting the reunion between your various English denominations, you fall under Paul's anathema—"He that provideth not for his own household, has denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

Let the strongest hold out the hand to the weak. If it were true, as it is said in the *EIRENICON*, that the Dissenters have just as much religion as comes to them through contact with the Church, Pusey would be the first to be held responsible at God's tribunal for not having offered all the religion of the Church for the benefit of Dissent. And if a single soul should perish for want of faith, let Pusey be assured that he will have to render an account to God of that lost soul for not having promoted domestic reunion, by means of which that soul might have been saved. It is upon this *EIRENICON*, which admits the Holy Spirit only in the Anglican Church, and excludes Dissenters from its participation—that, if any are condemned, Christ will say to its author, *Ex ore tuo te judico*, since that soul would not have been lost if, instead of promoting union with apostacy and error, you had promoted it between yourself and your brethren of your own country.

This reunion of brethren is a thousand times easier

of accomplishment than the reunion with strangers. I have proved the incompatibility, the inadmissibility, and the impossibility of reunion with the Roman and Greek Churches; but nothing of the sort interferes with the reunion with Dissenters. You are all Protestants; you have all the same rule of faith; you all equally respect the Bible; reconciliation, then, only waits your desire. To put it in Pusey's terms, it is but a question of words. Explain the words, and the reunion is accomplished. Can it be necessary to reunion that you should be all stereotyped in the same form, and have but a single thought upon subjects indifferent and of secondary importance? Certainly not. Let the *patristomaniacs* of Oxford remember the saying of Augustine—*In dogmatibus unitas, in dubiis libertas in omnibus charitas*. Have unity of dogma, and allow liberty to all in open questions; employ charity in all things, and reunion between Church and Dissent will be the result, and prove the most glorious triumph for those who have effected it.

It is injustice, then, towards the Nonconformist brethren to prefer reunion with Rome to reunion with them; *ergo*, the EIRENICON is an injustice.

I will add just a word upon the civil side of the question. What does Pusey hope to obtain by union with Rome? If there is nothing to gain on the spiritual side, on the political there is everything to lose. Where the Church of Rome enters it will dominate, and where it dominates it destroys every germ of civil liberty. Wherever Catholics are pro-

gressing in free institutions at the present day, it is only by reconquering foot by foot the territory usurped by Rome and braving her threats, of position and ex-communications. You wish to unite with such a curse? And you call yourselves Englishmen and patriots!

I do not stay here to discuss whether Rome would succeed in England, as she has with other countries. Still, taking note of what has occurred in England since the passing of the Act of Emancipation, and especially since the Papal aggression, and judging by what the English Papist journals write respecting their hopes, it is not difficult to arrive at the conclusion, that reunion with Rome would introduce into England, if not the death of her glorious liberties, at least, a permanent conspiracy against them. Pusey and his party would call such a reunion justice to the country, I suppose?

Let not the Unionists laugh at my expense because of my sinister presentiments. I can invoke to my aid the authority of such against whom laughter and apish grimace are of no worth. Helvetius says, in reference to such fatal reunion, "It is the same with Papacy as with despotism; both the one and the other devour the country in which they establish themselves. The surest means of weakening the powers of England and Holland would be to establish the Catholic religion there!"*

"E questo sia sugel ch'ogni uomo sganni." (†)

* De l'Homme, tome v. p. 186.

† "This be the seal which undeceives every man."—DANTE.

COROLLARY.

Let no one, then, ask for peace with Rome. Only traitors can be interested in such a peace, which is a peace with error, apostacy, and abomination.

It is the duty of those who live in Babylon to come out and be recognized as the people of God. To go to it is perversity and crime. The elect who would be found faithful at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ can have no communion with the mother and mistress of infidelity.

Let Christian hearts pray for those who live in the deception of Rome, that they may be converted; pray for those who live in the spirit of the Reformation, that they may not be perverted; pray for humanity which is torn by schisms and distracted by hatred, that the common Father may gather all together into the true fold of salvation, which is not that of Rome or the Popes, but that of the mystical Jerusalem, and the God-Man Christ, to whom alone be all honour, and praise, and love, now and for ever. Amen!

THE END.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.*

BATH.—Dr. W. Nash, W. West, Arnold, C. Hutton, Rev. C. Cooke, Rev. W. H. Dyer, Coxwell Rogers, Hutchings, Miss Compton, Miss F. Marriot, Miss Briscole, A. J. Godfrey.

BIRMINGHAM.—Rev. D. A. Owen, T. H. Aston, J. Nerve, B. Phillips, H. Armfield, J. Stokes, J. Hart, T. Scott, Rev. C. Brittain, Rev. G. Whitehead, Rev. J. Peareen, E. Heelay, Lewis, T. Bagley, I. Aston, A. Lady, G. Beley, 2 copies.

BRISTOL.—O. Sheppey, Widimark, R. D. Robjant, Lee (Bedminster), Miss Jones, J. Butler, 2 copies, C. Seymour, 10 copies, S. Porrie, M. E. Parkhurst, 6 copies.

CHELTONHAM.—Dr. Guinness, C. Cambray, Huddleston, Miss S. Jones, T. Phillips, 4 copies.

DUBLIN.—Bownsell, Rev. T. Scott, 4 copies.

EXETER.—Sprague, A. B. Matthews, B. F. Carr, J. Wills, P. Varwell, T. Andrews, A. Greenhue.

FALMOUTH.—R. O. Job, W. Fox, S. Lear, J. Roberts, Junr., J. Dorning, R. R. Broad, J. Freeman, J. H. Tilly, H. Tilly, F. Halligan, H. Mitchell, E. Bank, R. Cork.

IPSWICH.—T. Goodwin, A. Gibb, W. Jackson, Mrs. Adronson.

LEAMINGTON.—Capt. Knight, Humphrey, Mrs. M. A. Cock, Mrs. Poole, Mrs. D. M'Clintock.

LISSKARD.—Rev. F. Cook, Miss Canthew, Miss La Penotiere.

LONDON.—Rev. J. C. Adam, Hatley, A. Gallico, C. W. Tinker, Mrs. C. E. Cutley, Mrs. Grace.

LOWESTOFT.—Rev. C. Herbert, W. Cole.

NEWCASTLE.—R. Eadie.

* The Author begs to be excused if any of the names should be found incorrect, as they were taken down by different hands at the end of some of his Lectures.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

NEWTON ABBOTT.—Veale, Mrs. Drew.

NORWICH.—W. Belding, W. Holt, A. Rapier, C. D. Ray, Mac-
kewne, Rev. Willis, G. Holmes, S. Clarke, J. Howlett.

PLYMOUTH.—J. S. Cornish, H. Luscombe, G. M. Stranger, W.
Brown, S. Risdon, S. Werkes, Rev. W. Elliot, Vicary, Edgecumbe,
Rev. J. Hawker, Mrs. Hawker, Miss Hawker, Mrs. Armstrong, J.
Chambers, Mrs. Bowden, Miss Brooking, Mrs. J. Howard, 2 copies,
Miss Northmore, W. T. Brown, Miss Holberton, Rev. F. Bellarney
(Devonport), Mrs. Kingcome.

SOUTH SHIELDS.—W. James, W. Wigham, W. Carr, J. S. Harper,
C. A. Wann, M. Stainton, J. Armstrong, 4 copies.

TAUNTON.—Rev. T. Mawkes, C. R. Cecil, Rev. G. Maugham
(Axminster).

TEIGNMOUTH.—Mrs. Carrick, Mrs. O. C. Field, Mrs. Norman, Mrs.
Massey, Rev. J. Birch, A Friend, 2 copies.

TORQUAY.—Mrs. M. Cash, Miss Smith, E. Browne (Liverpool).

TRURO.—Miss Mackelkan, Mrs. Robert Blee.

WINCOBANK HALL.—Mrs. M. A. Rawson, 8 copies.

WOLVERHAMPTON.—Dr. F. Fraser.

MISCELLANEOUS.—T. Sharp, Bowdon; W. Lowcock, Manchester;
Rev. F. E. Valpy, Athborough; G. Pedlar, Warren Stoke.



